



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 4MXW W

675
Shimeall

Harvard Divinity School



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

MDCCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

AGE OF THE WORLD,
AS FOUNDED ON THE SACRED RECORDS,
HISTORIC AND PROPHEPIC;
AND THE
"SIGNS OF THE TIMES,"
VIEWED IN THE ASPECT OF PREMONITIONS
OF THE
SPEEDY ESTABLISHMENT ON THE EARTH,
OF THE
MILLENIAL STATE,
BY THE SECOND, PERSONAL, PRE-MILLENIAL ADVENT OF CHRIST:
WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY,
VINDICATING THE CLAIMS OF SACRED CHRONOLOGY AGAINST THE
CAVILS OF THE
ATHEIST, ANTIQUARIAN, AND INFIDEL.

*Originally delivered in Three Lectures, at the Apollo Rooms, Broadway, New-York,
on the Sunday Evenings of December 26th, 1841, and January 2d, and 23d, 1842.*

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

"The vision is yet for an appointed time; but at the end it shall speak and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come; it will not tarry."—*Habakkuk*.
"Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand."—*St. John*.

BY THE REV. R. C. SHIMEALL.
A Presbyterian of the Prot. Epis. Church in the Diocese of New-York.
AUTHOR OF SCRIPTURAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL CHARTS, WATTS' SCRIPT.
HIST. ENLARGED, TREATISE ON PRAYER, ETC.

NEW-YORK:
SWORDS, STANFORD & CO.
152 Broadway,
1842.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM
THE BEQUEST OF
EVERT JANSEN WENDALL
1918

J46 242-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842, by
THE REV. R. C. SHIMEALL;
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of
New-York.

A. G. FOWELL, PRINT.

TO ALL
INTERESTED IN THE
MOMENTOUS INQUIRY
AS TO WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH
OF
"TIMES AND SEASONS,"

THESE LECTURES ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,

BY THEIR HUMBLE SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

"ALMIGHTY GOD, GIVE US GRACE THAT WE MAY
CAST AWAY THE WORKS OF DARKNESS, AND PUT
UPON US THE ARMOUR OF LIGHT, NOW IN THE TIME
OF THIS MORTAL LIFE, IN WHICH THY SON JESUS
CHRIST CAME TO VISIT US IN GREAT HUMILITY;

THAT IN THE LAST DAY,

WHEN HE SHALL COME AGAIN IN HIS GLORIOUS
MAJESTY TO JUDGE BOTH THE QUICK AND THE
DEAD. WE MAY RISE TO THE LIFE IMMORTAL,
THROUGH HIM WHO LIVETH AND REIGNETH WITH
THEE AND THE HOLY GHOST, NOW AND EVER.

AMEN."

CONTENTS.

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| PREFACE. | PAGE XV |
|---------------|------------|

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY.

SECTION I.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| The subject of the first Lecture. — The Age of the World according to Scripture — believed by some — <i>rejected</i> by others. | 1 |
| Of the latter there are <i>three</i> classes, the Atheist, the Infidel, and the Antiquarian; and some also who profess Christianity. | 2 |
| I. Proposition I. THAT THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE, OF WHICH OUR GLOBE FORMS A PART, IS NOT ETERNAL — CONSEQUENTLY, OUR GLOBE, OR THE WORLD WHICH WE INHABIT, IS NOT ETERNAL. | 4 |
| 1. (1) ATHEISM. — <i>Christianized Atheism</i> | ib |
| Its advocates, Grotius and Vatabulus. Their perversion of Gen. i. 1. | ib |
| Also of Eccles. i. 9 — 11. | 6 |
| (2.) Atheism <i>undisguised</i> , or the Aristotelian philosophy. Averroes, Avicenna, Alfaraba, and others. | 7 |
| Spinoza. — His system defined. | 8 |
| Defective. — The whole created universe constituted of the essence of matter, or of mind, or both — and, if not common to all, it is to a part — MAN. | ib |
| <i>Matter</i> . What. | 11 |
| Refutation of the Atheistic principle of the eternity of matter. | ib |
| <i>Intelligence</i> . Proof of. | 12 |
| Result. — Evidence from Scripture. | 13 |
| Tertullian's consequent triumph over Thales the Grecian philosopher. | 16 |
| Collins, the Free-thinker. | ib |
| Conclusion. | ib |



SECTION II.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2. The <i>Antiquarian</i> . He admits the Eternal existence of the <i>Great First Cause</i> , but claims, THAT REMOTE AUTHENTIC ANTIQUITY ASCRIBES A VASTLY GREATER AGE TO THIS GLOBE, THAN THAT SET FORTH BY THE INSPIRED WRITERS..... | 17 |
| This claim, founded on the ancient cabalas of the <i>Hindoos</i> , <i>Egyptians</i> , <i>Chinese</i> , <i>Persians</i> , <i>Etruscans</i> , &c..... | ib |
| These accounts admitted as matters of <i>historical record</i> , but denied to be founded in <i>truth</i> ; and an <i>antecedent</i> antiquity claimed in behalf of the <i>Sacred</i> writings, upon a comparison with the <i>profane</i> , as predicated of their <i>INTERNAL</i> evidence..... | 19 |
| (1.) The sources of <i>Ante-diluvian</i> profane antiquity. Thyoth — Sanchoniathon — while uncorrupted left accounts very agreeable to that of Moses. — No existing accounts that can be relied on. — corrupted at an early period. — Extravagant..... | 20 |
| (2.) Profane <i>Post-diluvian</i> History. Herodotus — Xenophon — Ctesias. — Learning of the Indians — Confucius. — Of the <i>original</i> works of the most ancient Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Grecians, no remains. — Herodotus not to be relied on — not so Ctesias..... | 23 |
| Catalogue of authorities respecting the Egyptian, Chinese, and Assyrian Dynasties. 1st. EGYPT. The old Egyptian Chronographeon. — Manetho. — Eratosthenes. — Josephus' Manetho — Chronographia of Sextus Julius Africanus. — Chronicon of Euseb. Pamphilus. — The Chronographia of Syn-cellus. — Canon Chron. of Sir John Marsham..... | 23 |
| 2d. CHINESE RECORDS..... | 28 |
| 3rd. ASSYRIAN DO. Herodotus, Ctesias, Xenophon, Aristotle, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus..... | ib |
| Perplexity of remote profane history, &c..... | 29 |
| Original invention of Letters..... | 30 |
| Coincidence of ancient Profane <i>Physiological</i> philosophy with the Cosmogony of Moses..... | 36 |
| Ancient Philosophers — Orpheus, Thales, Pythagorus, Plato, Aristotle. — Pherecydes, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxigoras. — Leucippus, Democritus. — Consequence of their departure from <i>tradition</i> . — First perverted by the Greeks. — Atheism of Aristotle. — Not so those who preceded him. — Conclusion. — necessity of a Divine Revelation..... | ib |

SECTION III.

ON TIME, as viewed in connexion with the origin of the material universe. — Import of the term "day," as used in the 1st chapter of Genesis — whether a natural day of 24 hours, or a period of vastly greater length. — Argument from *analogy* in nature and Providence — from the physiological and oryctological discoveries of science.

I. Presumptive evidence, as derived from the *six days* work of creation. 47

On this subject, there are *four* classes of opinions. 51

Examination of the Theory, which attributes the creation of the globe out of the destruction of a previously existing planet. 52

Examination of the above four classes of opinions. 56

Evidence, that the six days *organization* of the material universe was each a period of vast length. — The question is not, what the Almighty *could* do, but what he actually *did* do. 58

I. That each of the six days was a period of vast length, is evident,

1. From the ordinary and obvious process of *organization* as therein described. 60

2. From the *physiological* structure of the globe. 62

The *first* creation comparatively *imperfect*. — This not a *new* theory. — Council of Nice A. D. 325. — Catechism of Edward VI. — Dr. Burnet.

Physical construction of the earth, as gathered from the various phenomena of the subterranean world. — Fossils. — cannot all be accounted for by the Deluge. — Harmony between the Mosaic cosmogony, and the scientific discoveries of physiology. — Folly of relying upon *human reason* alone, in the application of this science to existing phenomena. — All difficulties vanish when viewed in connexion with *Revelation*.

SECTION IV.

Duration of the *Sabbatical Rest* of the Almighty. — Assumed to be 6000 years — if so, then arguing *homogeneously*, each of the six days was a period of 6000 years. — Faber on this point... 84

Recapitulation, &c. 89

SECTION V.

3. *Infidelity*. Objection, that Moses cannot be the author of the books ascribed to him. — Answered..... 92

LECTURE I.

AGE OF THE WORLD, &c.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Text, Matt. xxiv., 3.....m | 97 |
| Analysis of the Introductory Essay..... | 97 |
| Subject. — Age of the World, &c. | |
| I. <i>Proposition</i> I. GOD IN HIS INFINITE WISDOM HAS ASSIGNED TO THE WORLD WHICH WE INHABIT, BOTH IN RELATION TO ITS PHYSICAL AND MORAL CONSTITUTION, A LIMITED AND DEFINITE DURATION. | |
| II. <i>Proposition</i> II. THIS LIMITED AND DEFINITE DURATION OF THE WORLD, AS COMPREHENDED UNDER THREE SUCCESSIVE DISPENSATIONS, PATRIARCHAL, JEWISH, AND CHRISTIAN, IS A SUBJECT FULLY REVEALED TO GOD'S PEOPLE IN HIS WORD..... | 100 |
| Paraphrase of the Text..... | ib |
| Christ's prediction. — Analysis of the xxivth and xxvth chapters of St. Matthew, from the Rev. G. E. Hare's "Christ to return."..... | 101 |
| The question proposed, — shall we attempt to fix upon the point of time, in round numbers, upon which we <i>now</i> stand, in the successive evolutions of God's dispensations to man?..... | 104 |
| Against such an attempt, there is an evident popular reluctance. — Abuse of the subject by fanatics. — Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. — Joanna Southcoate and the Mormon delusion. — Word of warning. — Elegant extract from the preface to Hare's "Christ to Return," by the Right Rev. L. S. Ives, D. D., Bishop of N. Carolina. | |
| A return to the question, as above..... | 113 |
| Objections..... | ib |
| Preliminaries. | |
| 1. Authoritative data of information in conducting our inquiries. — Annals of <i>Profane</i> chronology..... | 115 |
| <i>Sacred</i> chronology. | |
| (1.) The Samaritan Pentateuch..... | 116 |

CONTENTS.

ix

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| (2.) The Septuagint..... | 117 |
| (3.) The Hebrew..... | ib |
| Which of these has the precedence in point of <i>Authority</i> | ib |
| Difference between the chronology of the Septuagint and Hebrew of 1500 years. — How accounted for..... | ib |
| Return to the two PROPOSITIONS at the head of this Lecture. — | |
| Quere, " <i>Can these things be?</i> " | 119 |
| Various forms of speech used in Scripture to designate TIME. — | |
| The term "Day," Gen. i. — The argument of analogy, <i>a priori</i> , from the WORD of God, harmonizes with the argument <i>a posteriori</i> , from the WORKS of God. | 120 |
| The length of the SEVENTH DAY determines (homogeneously) the length of each of the <i>six</i> days. — Preliminaries. — <i>Pre-Adamites</i> | 122 |
| The Seventh Day, — when did it <i>commence</i> ? What is <i>length</i> ? | 130 |
| Objection, no <i>express</i> declaration of this in Scripture..... | 135 |
| Answer to this, as founded on <i>inferential</i> proof. — Questions from the most ancient <i>Brahmenical</i> Sages. — <i>Jewish</i> writers. — <i>Christian</i> writers. — The SCRIPTURES..... | 126 |
| The <i>Seal</i> of prophetic mysteries as to times and seasons now broken. — The two propositions as above merged into one. — Bickersteth on this subject..... | 142 |
| Objection to this exposition, viz., that it is a <i>trifling evasion</i> | 145 |
| Answer..... | 147 |
| Proof, that times and seasons <i>were revealed</i> to CHRIST, &c..... | 149 |
| With this representation corresponds the <i>general tenor</i> of God's word, <i>Historic and Prophetic</i> , in determining, with the utmost precision THE AGE OF THE WORLD, from the creation and fall of man, down to the consummation of all things. — For this purpose A GOLDEN CHAIN OF MEASUREMENT is given, which we divide into two parts..... | 151 |
| The necessity of fixing upon a <i>criterion of measurement</i> of time, the questions, are the years in sacred time, <i>historic and prophetic</i> , the same? Does time, as measured by <i>sacred</i> chronology, harmonize with our <i>solar</i> year? meeting us at every turn | 153 |
| Chronology, as a <i>science</i> , possesses few attractions, hence, little studied, and less understood, yet susceptible of explanation, even to ordinary minds..... | 153 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Chronology treats of <i>divisions</i> of time, rather than of time in the abstract. | 155 |
| Has finally attained to great perfection. | 157 |
| Length of the <i>Solar</i> year. — Of the <i>Lunar</i> . — The latter adopted by the <i>Arabians</i> , forms the measurement of time of the <i>Mahomedan Era</i> . — <i>Profane</i> history measured by the <i>Solar</i> year of 365 days. | |
| Length of the <i>Ante-diluvian</i> year. | 159 |
| Dr. Halley's account of the ancient philosophers. | 160 |
| The <i>Brazen Age</i> . — Era of <i>Sesostris</i> . — Thales, the first to correct the <i>Greek</i> year. — The Greeks however, not the "pioneers" of astronomical science. — Their astronomy between the time of Solon and Hipparchus, vague and undefined. — The <i>Attic</i> or <i>Athenian</i> lunar year. — The <i>Macedonian</i> Calendar. — The <i>Greek Œcumenical</i> Council. — The era of the <i>Seleucidae</i> . — The <i>Cecropian Era</i> and <i>Parian Chronicle</i> . — The <i>Consular Era</i> . — The <i>Olympiads</i> . | |
| The <i>JULIAN</i> year. | 168 |
| The <i>GREGORIAN</i> Calendar. | 170 |
| The <i>Persians</i> | 171 |
| Origin and progress of <i>Cycles</i> , to harmonize the <i>Lunar</i> with the <i>Solar</i> year. — Cleostratus. — The first Cycle of Dieteres, of two years. — The Tetraeteris, a Cycle of four years. — The Octoeteris, of eight years. — The Cycle of Meto, of nineteen years. — The Calippic Cycle of seventy-six years. The Julian, and Juliano-Gregorian Cycle, now the universally admitted standard. | ib |
| Proof of the difference between <i>Ante-diluvian</i> and <i>Post-diluvian</i> solar time. | 176 |
| Quere. Can the sacred <i>Jewish</i> year (<i>lunar</i>) <i>Historic</i> and <i>Prophetic</i> , be made to harmonize with the <i>JULIAN</i> solar year? — Answer. As of the <i>Julian</i> solar year, so of the <i>Jewish lunar</i> year. <i>INTERCALARY</i> TIME was a characteristic peculiar to both. Hence the <i>harmony</i> of the one with the other. | 178 |
| Differences of opinion on this subject. | 179 |
| Shuckford. — Prideaux. | |
| Proof of Jewish Intercalations. | 182 |
| I. Of Jewish time from the <i>Flood</i> to the <i>Exode</i> | ib |
| II. At the time of the <i>Exode</i> | 183 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| III. After the CAPTIVITIES.— Their first Cycle of <i>eighty-four</i> years.— Their adoption of the Cycle of Meto.— Rabbi Samuel.— Rabbi Adda.— Rabbi Hillel..... | 187 |
| But as of the Jewish <i>Ecclerastical</i> , so of the <i>Civil</i> year.— Jubilees..... | 189 |
| Conclusion..... | 192 |
| Return to the subject of the <i>golden measurement of time</i> , of the SEVE TH DAY, or sabbatical rest of the Creator..... | 193 |
| I. First division. HISTORICAL chronology. | |
| 1. <i>First period</i> . From creation and fall, to the Deluge. | |
| 2. <i>Second Period</i> . From the Deluge to Abraham. | |
| 3. <i>Third Period</i> . From Abraham to the Exode. | |
| 4. <i>Fourth Period</i> . From the Exode to the death of Saul. | |
| 5. <i>Fifth Period</i> . From the death of Saul, to the commencement of the Babylonish captivity. | |
| 6. <i>Sixth Period</i> . The captivity. | |
| 7. <i>Seventh Period</i> . The interval between the end of the Babylonish captivity, and the commencement of the 70 prophetic weeks of Daniel. | |
| Examination of the <i>discrepancies</i> in the chronology of the Septuagint, Samaritan, and Hebrew versions, and that of Josephus..... | 194 |
| <i>First Period</i> , with tabular view..... | 205 |
| <i>Second Period</i> ,.....do..... | ib |
| { <i>Third Period</i> ,.....do..... | 206 |
| { <i>Fourth Period</i> ,.....do..... | |
| <i>Fifth Period</i> ,.....do..... | 218 |
| <i>Sixth Period</i> ,.....do..... | ib |
| <i>Seventh Period</i> ,.....do..... | 219 |
| Summary..... | 221 |
| II, Second division.— PROPHETIC chronology..... | 221 |
| Of the prophetic <i>numbers</i> , which, with the preceding, as the aggregate number of years in sacred <i>Historic</i> chronology from the creation, make up the 6000 years as the limits set by God to the duration of time..... | 222 |
| Consequences, upon the paradventure of an <i>error</i> in the <i>Historic</i> chronology..... | 223 |
| Mode of measuring time prophetically..... | 224 |
| <i>Practical</i> uses of prophetic mystical numbers.— “Seven times.” | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| — Dan. iv., 16.—1260 years.— Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7.—42 months. Rev. xi. 2, xiii. 5.—2300 days of years. Dan. viii. 14.—70 weeks. Dan. ix. 24—27.—1200 and 1335 years of Dan. xii. 11, 12.—1260 days of Rev. xii. 6.—666. Rev. xiii. 18.—2300 years. Dan. viii. 14.— Their commencement and termination..... | 229 |
| Four beasts of Dan. vii.— Ram and He-goat of chap. viii.— Effect on Daniel.— Offers prayer.— Daniel's solicitude.— An Angel explains the 2300 years.— The 2300 years of chap. viii. 14, and the 70 weeks or 490 of chap. ix. 24—27, have a common commencement.— The 70 weeks end with the conversion of Cornelius.— Tabular view, &c..... | 249 |
| The 70 weeks commence A. M. 3679.— The 2300 years end A. D. 1847.— Cleansing of the sanctuary.— SECOND ADVENT.— three additional prophetic numbers, viz., the 1260, 1290, and 1335 years.— Includes the career of the two persecuting powers, the <i>Papacy</i> and <i>Mahometanism</i> .— Mark of the Papal beast, 666.— Supposed corresponding mark of the Mahometan power.— Decree of Pope Vitalian, A. D. 666,— Summary respecting these two anti-christian powers.— The two other anti-christian powers, the <i>Pagan</i> and the <i>Infidel</i> .— Conclusion..... | 254 |
| The date of the commencement of the 1260 years..... | ib |
| A. D. 533.— Ends, A. D. 1793..... | 261 |
| Judgment of "the Ancient of Days" on the Papal beast still continues..... | 269 |
| Summary..... | ib |

LECTURE II.

"SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| The subject stated..... | 273 |
| "Signs," not a matter of conjecture or mere speculation..... | 274 |
| Claim of <i>redundant</i> evidence as a condition of belief, considered.— Incredulity.— Idle curiosity.— To <i>Prophecy</i> , What? — "Signs,"— What?..... | 279 |
| "Signs."— Design of:— Source of hesitancy, doubt, and unbelief in relation to them.— Reply.— Illustration. | |
| Portentous events preceded by signs..... | 285 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Applied to the <i>First Advent</i> | 286 |
| Evidence from the above of the error which supposes no prophecy can be understood until fulfilled..... | 289 |
| "Signs."—Why added to dates..... | 291 |
| Harmony between prophecy and doctrines.—Uses of..... | 293 |
| This a subject of momentous interest. | |
| Difficulties, in applying "Signs" to the <i>future</i> | 295 |
| Prophetic symbols defined..... | 297 |
| Of these there are two classes.— <i>First class</i> .—Their order.— <i>Second class</i> .—Embraces two predictions.—Necessity to discriminate between what "Signs" are symbolical, and what are not. | |
| <i>Literality</i> not excluded from a prophetic symbol..... | 299 |
| Nor a <i>literal sign</i> from bearing a <i>typical</i> aspect. | |
| Prophetic signs of Luke xxi. 25, explained..... | ib |
| Assignment of, to their relative position in prophecy..... | 304 |
| An appeal.——reflection..... | 311 |
| I. <i>First sign</i> . The prevalent disinclination of Christian professors and others, to think of, or to study the subject of unfilled Scripture prophecy..... | 313 |
| II. <i>Second Sign</i> . A most melancholy and general decay of vital piety..... | 315 |
| I. <i>Third Sign</i> . An unprecedented prevalence of iniquity. Under this sign, we add 19 characteristics, from St. Paul's prediction, 2 Tim. iii. 1—5..... | 316 |
| IV. <i>Fourth Sign</i> . The predicted prevalence of scoffers in these last times. | |
| V. <i>Fifth Sign</i> . The universal spread of the gospel among all nations. | |
| VI. <i>Sixth Sign</i> . Indulgence in some of the worst passions of our nature, by professing Christians. | |
| VII. <i>Seventh Sign</i> . The advance of human science, and the practical rejection of the presiding wisdom of Revelation. | |
| VIII. <i>Eighth Sign</i> . The symbolic import of the Sun, Moon, and Stars, &c. | |
| IX. <i>Ninth Sign</i> . The universal determination of the dominant nations of Europe to maintain the mutual relations of peace. | |
| X. <i>Tenth Sign</i> . Wars and rumors of wars, famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, together with wonders, signs, &c. | |

- XI. *Eleventh Sign.*** The predicted approaching overthrow of the Turkish Empire.
- XII. *Twelfth Sign.*** A prelude to and the immediate precursor of, the destruction of the Papal hierarchy.
- XIII. *Thirteenth Sign.*** The present circumstances and expectations of the Jews.
- XIV. *Fourteenth Sign.*** The evidences of our having entered into the 1335 years, proof of the commencement of the sounding of the Seventh Trumpet.
- XV. *Fifteenth Sign.*** The superabundant light which the HOLY SPIRIT has thrown of late on the Prophetic Word.

PREFACE.

AN apology is due to those through whose solicitations the following Lectures are published, for the delay which has attended their appearance. This delay has been occasioned, partly by circumstances entirely beyond the author's control, and partly from those *additions* to their original form, which the result of revision rendered indispensable.

In conducting our inquiries regarding *the Age of the World*, we have deemed it requisite to fortify the basis of our authority (the Scriptures) against the attacks alike of the *Atheist*, the *Antiquarian*, and the *Infidel*; refuting the alleged eternity of the existence of matter and of the globe, of the first—the claims of a vastly greater antiquity for the history of the human race than that given by Moses, of the second—and the denial of the authenticity of the Sacred Records, of the third. This part of the volume, contained in the “Introductory Essay,” will, we trust, be found particularly serviceable to those whose minds are wandering in the wilderness of uncertainty and conjecture on these important subjects.

Nor, in the prosecution of our inquiries into this matter, is it a little embarrassing to be brought into perpetual collision with the most inveterate prejudices, on the one hand, and a certain class of existing facts,

claiming affinity with the premises whence follow all our deductions on the other. To explain ourselves: The popular theology of the day attributes the creation and formation of the material universe, of which the globe we inhabit is a part, to the work of *six natural or solar days, of twenty-four hours*—and a strong suspicion of a tendency to *Atheism* attaches to every suggestion, calculated to disturb opinions which have been pillowed upon the lap of centuries.

This, however, to the contrary notwithstanding,—we feel bound to pay a respectful deference to *facts*, or what are even *claimed* to be such. It is asserted, then, in opposition to the above, that “*if the world was really created in six days, we should find some evidences of it in the aspect of nature. Instead of this, we find, in the geognostic structure of the earth, the infallible proof of its having existed for (many) ages, and undergone many prodigious revolutions, long before the most ancient nations existed.*” These infallible proofs it is claimed, are to be found in the physiological and oryctological discoveries of science, “regarding the strata composing the outer shell of this globe, and the remains of organized bodies which are found in them. It is ascertained that these remains do not occur promiscuously, but in a determinate order, *corresponding exactly with that which is given in the first chapter of Genesis.*” To test the *validity* of this claim, we undertook the task of a classification of the Mosaic cosmogony of the creation, with the series of strata as given in the geological table of Cuvier. The result the reader will

find by turning to pages 70 and 71. "Thus, *human* bones are only found in the uppermost, or very newest, alluvial soil. Further down are found the remains of *quadrupeds*, belonging to a species *now extinct*; these are mixed with sea shells and marine petrifications. At a still lower depth are found the exuvise of *alligators*, and other amphibious animals, of an appearance unlike any species that now exist; for they seem to have been deposited while the laws of nature, in the animal kingdom, admitted the *metempsychosis* (alluded to in ancient tradition) *anterior* to the introduction of *death*. Deeper still are found immense beds of *carbonaceous* matter, which we know is the basis of *vegetable* substances. Lowest of all are found strata of common rocks, containing no petrifications, no traces of carbon. These rocks seem to have been formed when the world was covered by an uninhabited sea."

"From all these concurring arguments, it is concluded that the work of creation occupied *immeasurable ages*, or *æons*; and that the vulgar *hypothesis*, which takes for granted that the earth, from the very beginning, spun round on its axis with its present amazing velocity, is not only *unphilosophical*, but expressly contrary to *the word of God*."

Now, these facts admitted — (and deny them we cannot —) I ask, — of what avail is it to denounce their tendency as *atheistical*, from their supposed contravention of the Mosaic cosmogony? Is not this a premature surrendering up of what may be demonstrated of a *coincidence* of the Scriptural account of

the creation with the above discoveries of science, to the vaunting triumphs of the materialist? We think so. And it has been our endeavor, in the sequel of the Introductory Essay, and of the first Lecture of this volume, to *reconcile* the claims of the one with the history of the other. How far we have been successful, we leave with the candor of the intelligent to decide. Nor, (as we have said,) can we relinquish the hope, that such may be brought to see the utter impossibility of harmonizing the Scriptural cosmogony of the Creation as an *inspired* production, with the physiological discoveries of the structure of our globe, in any other way: yea more — that science, as an *hand-maid* to inspiration, by the rays of refraction, as collected from known existing phenomena in the physical construction of the earth, elucidates and confirms it. Indeed, science, when made subservient to any other end; in other words, when it is relied on as a guide in our search of truth to the *exclusion* of REVELATION, serves but to furnish evidence of the lamentable defectibility of *human reason*. On this subject, we are furnished with an inspired admonition,—to “avoid profane and vain babblings, and *oppositions of science*, FALSELY so called, which some professing, have *erred* concerning the faith.”¹

Such, in the sequel of this volume, we have considered the *diluvian theory* of Cuvier. Such also the theory, that the chaotic mass out of which this earth was formed, was produced by the destruction of one

1. 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.

of the previously existing planets, by the shock of some comet, as advocated by Basilius, Halley, Herschel, Vince, Smith, Jennings, Lardner, etc. Finally and above all, such the electro-magnetic theory of the distinguished author of the late *moon hoax*, resolving "the alternate *creation and dissolution of all natural bodies* to the influence of Terrestrial Magnetism on the *past, present, and future* condition of this world," as predicated of the principle, that as "all motion must result from two forces"—one to "repel," another to "attract;"—So "the necessary effect,"—"the production of a *CIRCLE*,"—"The great circle of *eternal alternations*, with the geometrically perfect triangle of *two forces and one matter* within it as an active and unerring principle," which is to "revolve forever, without end as *without beginning*:" and that there is not "a living form in nature which is not produced by these forces, from other kinds of matter, as in their original process of creation," &c.

Now, with the most profound deference to the superior scientific attainments of this gentleman, in his zealous endeavors to revive in this Christian land the thousand-and-one times exploded Atheistic theory of Aristotle, *alias*, the modern Pantheism of Germany, we beg to submit, whether he has not overlooked some of the *simplest* and the *soundest rudiments* of true philosophy. Take, for example, the following—"Matter is perceived by *sense*, mind is understood by *reason*; but *mind* cannot be *perceived*, neither can *matter* be *understood*. Our *senses* inform us only respecting the phenomena of *matter*; our *reason* in-

forms us only respecting the phenomena of *mind*. In the universe, our senses perceive nothing but matter ; while our understanding assures us that every thing most depend upon mind. We cannot *perceive* the efficiency of an intelligent cause, neither can we *understand* the efficiency of a *physical* one. Intelligent efficient causation is beyond our *senses* ; physical efficient causation is beyond our *understanding*. Hence the opposite doctrines of Berkeley and Hume ; the one denying the existence of *matter*, the other denying the existence of *mind* ; and each supporting his hypothesis by (apparently) plausible arguments. Of *the essence of matter*, we are as ignorant as we are of *the essence of mind*. We know them only by their properties, i. e., their relations or analogies.

"Accordingly, our knowledge of matter and mind is only a knowledge of *relations or analogies*. But these analogies are only parts of *one great analogy*, embracing all possible knowledge. Every subject of human thought is connected with an immense scheme, which comprehends the natural and moral universe. Every object, atom, thought, or idea, the least as well as the greatest, are all parts of that scheme — and there is nothing *absolute* but God — nothing, however small or insignificant, which can be *thoroughly* known, but by Him who *knows the whole*. And, for the benefit of this philosopher we now add,— Hence, "the failure of every attempt hitherto made, to detect the arrangement or *method of nature*, in mineralogy, botany, zoology, &c."¹ In all our systems, we proceed

1. See the works of Linnæus, &c.

upon the idea of the *straight line*, ranking the objects of our study one after another, from the beginning to the end. But in the *method of nature*, the *straight line* is blended with the *circle and the sphere*, so that each object depends not merely upon those which precede and follow it, but upon those which surround it, and the *great whole* of which it forms a *part*. And it is so arranged, that every part is, as it were, a *miniature* of the *whole*. This method of circles within circles, "*wheels within wheels*," (Ezek. i. 16,) is manifestly the true "*method of nature*" in all her works. *It is indeed, to human reason inextricable ;*

"Mazes intricate,
Eccentric, intervolved, yet regular, '
Then most, when most irregular they seem." 1

Still, this philosopher finds, "even in the commencement of the sacred history," that "there is a high doctrine of religion *intimated* in the word *Elohim*, Gods—designating a plurality IN THE CREATIVE POWER of the universe!" Shade of Spinoza, what meaneth this! Why, that this "*intimated* creative power of the universe," which he elsewhere condescends to term "the Divine hand in creation," as "all the forms and modifications of *matter* are the results of *motion*," coincides "with the deductions of philosophy—two spiritual or immaterial *forces*," (one to "repel," another to "attract," and which forms his great electro-magnetic circle,) "acting upon *matter*,"

1. Macnab's Theory, &c.; pp. 2, 38.

appear not only to be absolutely necessary, but to actually exist." Please, reader, while on this subject, turn to pages 8, and 38—41, of this volume, and see what of difference you discover between the above ideas of a Supreme, Intelligent, Great First Cause, and the Atheism of Spinoza and Aristotle; and yet, our recondite philosopher can accommodate his Protean theory to "the great doctrine of the Trinity"—and can see it also beautifully *revived* (!) and illustrated in the Christian creed of an *incarnate principle*," &c.

And so, this philosopher also "intimates" his belief in "the Scriptures," as "fully unerringly inspired." But he has had the sagacity to discover, that "the *Hindu* Scriptures are EQUALLY PROFOUND upon these subjects with the *Christian*,"—that the Mosaic history of the serpent, "instead of being a literal account of a diabolical miracle, is, in reality, a profound and pregnant apologue"—and that "the tree of life is the magnetic axis of the earth," while the tree of knowledge of good and evil, is the axis of rotation, &c.

What others think of this gentleman's theory we know not. Doubtless it has its admirers. We pretend not to have analyzed its principles minutely. This, for want of time and space, we could not do. But it is our deliberate opinion, that a more bold, heaven-daring, God-dishonoring theory, under the mask of Christianity, has never been brought into vogue in this or any other Christian country.

We deem it here of the utmost importance that the reader distinguish between the Age of the World Geo-

logically, and the *Age of the World Historically*. Regarding the first, the theory we adopt ascribes to the *chaotic elements of nature* a vast, though limited and indefinite existence; and amplifies the "*six days*" into six periods of uniform and definite length. It dates the commencement of the second from the *Creation and Fall* of our first parents, and exposes the fallacy of the antiquarian, who, by confounding the geological with the historical Age of the World, lays claim to a vastly greater antiquity for the history of the human race, than that given by Moses.

That our distribution of periods as above, into indefinite and definite, are generally adopted by geologists, we do not pretend. We invite an examination of our Scriptural argument in support of the latter. Of the Lectures now in course of delivery in this city by Professor Lyell, President of the Geological Society of London, as reported in the "*Tribune*," (our engagements having denied us the pleasure of hearing them,) we have discovered nothing to contravene the sentiment as expressed by himself, that man, through the aid of this science, is "enabled, by his superior organization, to go back and trace the history of his great birth-place and residence, the earth, and all it has gone through, and what beings lived and died upon it, as he finds it engraved on its rocky pages—on the stony tablets of this interesting book—imperishably engraven on the solid frame-work of the earth itself. *These laws tend not to materialism*; they are the expression of the supreme will imprinted on matter. *These laws belong not to material things*, but lead us up

to the contemplation of a great and immaterial LAW GIVER ! ”

Finally, the Title-page in its present form, sufficiently indicates its object.

That the subject of which it treats is one of absorbing interest, it is presumed none will deny. Of all other subjects however, in the entire range of Theology, not one is called to encounter similar prejudices — not one less likely to gain universal credence. The diversified conclusions of the learned in the department of sacred *historic* chronology — the frequent proofs afforded by the lapse of time of errors regarding *prophetical* dates — and the denial, consequently, of any practical good resulting therefrom, have contributed to confirm the general impression, that the disclosure of a knowledge of “times and seasons” forms no part of the divine purpose, in the dispensations of his providence and grace to mankind.

To a reflecting mind, however, it cannot but appear as passing strange, that the Great Disposer of all events connected with the affairs of men in this lower world, should have furnished *no ray of light* to guide them in these premises. That he has done so in various instances, is fully demonstrated in the sequel. True, as it respects the *entire period* assigned to the divinely constituted order of things in the physical and moral worlds, it is not pretended that we are anywhere furnished with an *explicit* declaration. This, however, it will be found, forms no valid objection to the claim as herein set forth, viz, — *That God in his infinite wisdom has assigned to the present*

constitution of things in this world, under three dispensations, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian, a limited and definite duration ; and that he has imparted a knowledge of the same to his people in his word.

As it respects the *differences* of the learned in the department of sacred *historic* chronology, while we revere great names, we can only admit them as *authoritative* in proportion as we are furnished with evidence of accuracy in their deductions. And we shall find ourselves not a little mistaken if a perusal of these pages does not result in a thorough conviction, that the past errors of the great and good in these premises are predicated of the fact, that as to every period is assigned a special purpose in the divine plans of Providence and Redemption ; and as to each belongs some great and appropriate truth ; so any attempt at a complete elucidation of it is more than premature, till a sufficient maturity of the divine plan should render it necessary. Now this, we say, by way of illustration, is specially true of "THE TIME OF THE END," spoken of by Daniel, Chap. xii. 6. All the intervening events portrayed in his series of chronometrical prophecies, he was commanded to "close and seal up," till *that* period should arrive. This, however, will not apply to the age of the Apostles,—they, interpreting prophetic time *literally*, (i. e., a day for a day,) being led to expect a very short interval to elapse between the two advents ; nor, during the life-time of our Redeemer, receiving any definite replies in answer to their frequent inquiries respecting this point.

That additional light, however, was given to the Church on this subject previous to the close of the New Testament Canon, we think we have fully shown. The instructions conveyed to St. John respecting the prophecies of his book, was directly opposite to that of Daniel. "SEAL NOT THE SAYINGS OF THIS BOOK."¹ The entire contents of the apocalyptic visions, therefore, and which are *synchronic* with those of Daniel, (save the seven apocalyptic thunders of chap. x. 4,) are given to us as a *key* to unlock the Divine purposes as well respecting times and seasons, as the nature and character of the events themselves; not that it was indispensable that these should be understood, except as pointing to *CRISIS*. Hence their comparative concealment till "the time of the end," under certain mystic forms, the practical effect of which was, to place the Church constantly on the watch-tower, "as though the day of Christ *was* at hand." *Now*, however, having the advantage of *historic* light in pointing out the *coincidence* of combined prophetic events (as those of Daniel and St. John) with what has actually transpired, there can, we think, remain but but little, if any doubt, as to the point of time upon which we now stand, in the successive evolutions of God's dispensations to man.

Of the *abuses* of this subject, by the fanatical, we have treated at large in the sequel.

The corroboration of the present "Signs of the Times," as brought to view in the second Lecture,

1. Rev. xxii. 10.

with the deductions of chronology, will, we trust, receive the serious and attentive perusal of all. They show that "the end of all things is at hand."¹

Copious references to authorities in this compilation are given ; nor will it, we trust, be found to derogate from the merits of our work, that we have been compelled, in some instances, to quote second-hand.

It will be a sufficient apology for our use of *emphatic words*, to state that we have written for the benefit of ALL.

We, in conclusion, commit these pages "to God, and to the word of his grace," which alone are able "to present you faultless before the presence of his glory, with exceeding joy."

R. C. SHIMEALL.

New-York, April, 1842.

1. Pet. iv. 7.

TO THE READER.

We respectfully request the special attention of the reader to the *Preface* of this volume. Our manuscript was completed, and nearly printed off, when our attention was called to a series of Lectures on the subjects of Geology, Terrestrial Magnetism, &c. ; the tendency of which, in the view of many, was decidedly derogatory to the interests of our venerable and holy religion. To satisfy ourselves on this point, so far as they are available to us up to this date, and the limits of our Preface would allow, we have examined them. The result is before you. A perusal of the volume however will furnish *additional data* on these points, which you will be enabled to apply at your leisure.

This volume enters upon and canvasses every question at all connected with the all-exciting and frequently agitated subject of SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY, *Historic* and *Prophetic*. The conclusion to which it conducts the reader, (in opposition to that of a cotemporary writer, Mr. Wm. Miller, who makes A. D. 1843 as the termination of the 6000th year of the world,) is, that it places the great day of crisis at 1847, and the end of the 6000th year, at 1868.

"Blessed is he that readeth."

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY, &c.

SECTION I.

THE subject matter of the *first* of the two following Lectures, presents to our view the events evolved in "the course of time" of full six thousand years! It treats of *The age of the world, as educed from the Chronological Records of Scripture, Historic and Prophetic, from the creation and fall of man, to the final consummation of all things.*

The work it assigns us, is an arduous one. "Lord, who is sufficient for these things!"¹ "Our sufficiency is of God."²

In the treatment of this subject, the intelligent reader will not fail to perceive, that while the *believer* in a Divine Revelation, from a conviction of its transcendant claims, stands ready, in the meekness of child-like docility, to yield his assent to its deductions upon the ground of its admitted inspiration, in proportion to the measure of *evidence* of their consistency therewith; others there are, who *repudiate* our deductions, by a *denial* of any claims to their regard or belief, of the **AUTHORITY** or foundation upon which they rest. Hence the following Introductory Essay.

1. 2 Cor. ii. 16.

2. 2 Cor. iii. 5.

Of those who impugn the authority of Scripture in these premises, there are THREE classes—the Atheist, the Antiquarian, and the Sceptic.

Says the *Atheist*, “matter is eternal—i. e. it is self-derived, self-productive, self-preservative. The various forms which it has assumed, are without *beginning*, without *end*. Hence, the material universe, of which our globe is a part, is *eternal*.”

Says the *Antiquarian*, remote authentic antiquity ascribes a *vastly greater age* to this globe, than that set forth by the inspired historian, Moses.

Says the *Infidel*, even if you demonstrate the present age of the world from the historic and prophetic parts of Scripture, yet I *reject* both their *inspiration* and *authenticity*.

To these, we may add a fourth class, who, though they *admit* the inspiration and authenticity of holy Scripture, and are enrolled among the number of those “who profess and call themselves Christians,” yet are shocked at the presumption of him who would venture to arrive, even at a tolerable degree of certainty, as to *the point of time*, in round numbers, upon which we *now* stand, in the successive evolutions of God’s dispensations to man.

Now, true, we might enter upon our subject, and dash on, “in medias res,” to the entire satisfaction, and, perhaps, edification of the reader: we might leave the three first above named systems, and their deluded votaries to perish together in unbelief: and, we might also leave the fourth class to an undisturbed indulgence of their present state of imaginary security, till,

“— in pomp and majesty ineffable,”

“the Lord of life and glory” descends “*in an hour when they think not,*”¹ to consummate his double work of destruction of the last great anti-Christian or infidel confederacy, (which confederacy, as we believe, is destined soon to swallow up, root and branch, every vestige of a *merely nominal* Christianity,) and to throw open wide the portals of the newly established “kingdom of heaven to all believers,”² leaving them “without,” to lift up their voices in the now unavailing cry of “Lord, Lord, open unto us !”³

But “we have not so learned Christ.” “What,” I would ask, “have *we*, that we have not received ?” “Who,” I would ask, “maketh *us* to differ ?” What can we, what would we say, but this, “*by the grace of God, I am what I am.*” O then, let us offer to the Most High a cheerful sacrifice of responsive obedience to the command, “*freely ye have received, freely give.*”⁴

“According” then, “to the ability which God giveth,”⁵ under the present diversified administrations of the Spirit,⁶ and with the sentiments and feelings, as we trust, rather of forbearance and compassion, than of reckless denunciation of any, even the most erring, we proceed to assume, as our first proposition, the following, viz :—

1. Matt. xxiv. 44.

2. Book of Com. Pr. Te Deum Laud.

3. Matt. xxv. 11.

4. Matt. x. 8.

5. 1 Pet. iv. 11.

6. 1 Cor. xii. 4, 6, 28.

I. THAT THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE, OF WHICH OUR GLOBE FORMS A PART, IS NOT ETERNAL—CONSEQUENTLY, OUR GLOBE, OR THE WORLD WHICH WE INHABIT, IS NOT ETERNAL.

On entering upon a refutation of the principle, antagonistic to the proposition here assumed, we must premise, that we have to contend, as well with a species of what we shall call *Christianized Atheism*, as with Atheism in its more *undisguised* form.

In the department of professedly Christian commentators, there are those, who, though they acknowledge the existence of an intelligent, great first cause, yet assert that the world is *eternal*. Of these, the learned Grotius and Vatabulus are the principal. In the place of Gen. i. 1, (as in the *English* version,) they substitute the following: "BEFORE God created the heavens and the earth, every thing was contained in the chaos." Hence, (as I suppose we must agree,) as the *chaos* was not the thing spoken of in the act of *creation*, it must have been *eternal*: therefore, the heavens and the earth, as contained in it, *must be eternal*. The above inference is as specious, as the rendering upon which it is based, is false. The second verse of the chapter refutes the whole theory, the *thing* created being the unformed heavens and earth in their CHAOTIC state. They were "*without form, and void*,"¹ the *αορατος* (*aoratos*) of the LXX, and the *inanis et vacua* of the vulgate. The primordial elements for the construction of the material

1. Gen. i. 1, 2.

earth and heavens, must have had an immediate *original* constitution—a *genesis*: and the *production* of this basis, or embryo, is what must be understood as the obvious and real intimation of the first verse of Genesis: it was the *first* production of the first *principia*—the very *creation* itself—the *producing* of the *primitive matter* of the *future constituents* of the universe—in other words, “the *substance* of the heavens, and the *substance* of the earth.”¹ With this agrees the original term בָּרָא *bara*, which signifies, “He created—caused to exist, spring forth—as the world, from nothing.”² Parkhurst’s rendering is, “To *create*: produce into BEING.” Hence, “IN the *beginning* the Ale-im CREATED the heavens and the earth.” And then adds he, “this cannot relate to *form*, because, as it follows in v. 2, ‘the earth,’ (i. e. that which was *created* in the beginning,) ‘was *without form*,’ or in loose atoms.” With these renderings agree also the קָטַדְזֵין (*ktidzein*) from קָטַדְזו (*ktidzo*) of the lxx. which signifies, “to build, raise up from the foundation, to create, form, fashion, appoint, constitute, to cause to exist, that which had no existence.”³ If more than this be implied in the above term, “*before*,” we then ask, did the universe exist before *existence* itself? Did it exist *anterior* to the *primordial elements* of which it is constructed? The theory carries with it its own refutation.

This theory however, claims *chiefly* for its support,

1. Parkhurst.

2. Roy’s Heb. and Eng. Dict. p. 107.

3. Roy’s Heb. and Eng. Dict. p. 107.

that remarkable saying of the wisest of princes, ¹ “ *The thing which hath been, is that which shall be, and that which is done, is that which shall be done, and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there any thing whereof it may be said, see, this is NEW? It hath been already of old time which was before us. There is no remembrance of former things, neither shall there be any remembrance of things that are to come : with those that shall come after.*” This passage the above commentators consider as *decisive*, in proof of the *eternity* of this world, past and future. Strange ! It will require but a cursory inspection of the passage to betray their sense of the *paucity* of scripture evidence to uphold a defenceless theory. Take the following in illustration :—Of every individual component of the world, it may be asked, “as of a *new-born* infant, for instance, — is this *new*? and the answer would be, “it hath been already of *old-time*, which was before us.” That is, it is not, strictly speaking, a thing which hath not been *before*, — it is merely a subject of *succession*, — a repetition of that which hath been ; nothing variant in its characteristic nature from its *precedent*. So also, the chemist, who, though he should produce a *new* compound, *new*, that is, in its *compounded* state, yet it cannot be strictly called *new*, because all its various and several components, either primarily, or secondarily, *existed before*.”

The passage is to be viewed rather as a splendid eulogy upon that wisdom with which the author of it was endowed. He meant to assert that no *rival* in the intellectual field should exceed *his* knowledge of

1. Eccl. i. 9—11.

the ways and works of God. As though he had said, 'Lo, I have seen *all* things under the sun, and the course of nature is such as will not produce any thing which *I have not acquainted* myself with, it having *already existed* : ' not from eternity, but "of OLD TIME ;" he then living about the three thousandth year of the world ; and this too, for the express purpose of setting before the minds of *future* generations, an open declaration of the *fallacy* of all sublunary things : for, high as he had extolled his wisdom, he adds, "ALL IS VANITY AND VEXATION OF SPIRIT."

Neither the world, then, which we inhabit, nor yet the chaos out of which it was formed, is eternal ; the CHAOS being the very thing set forth by Moses as created "*in the beginning*."

We come now to remark, that arguments professedly adduced *from* scripture, to prove the eternity of the world, it is sufficient to refute *by* scripture. POLYTHEISTIC and other, the like systems of Atheism, however, require a different mode of treatment. Its advocates respectable, both in number and intellect, have embraced some of the master-spirits of every age. The ARISTOTELIAN philosophy, besides including considerable numbers of Jews and Mahomedans, enrolls among its champions the names of *Averroes*, *Avicenna*, *Alfaraba*, and *others*. Their respective systems (if systems they may be called) taught, that the material earth and heavens were the products of a *blind casualty* — a fortuitous concourse of confusedly agitated atoms, that sprang from matter which was *eternal*.

We cannot now detain you by a comparison of the

atheism of Aristotle, with that of the more modern Spinoza. Suffice it now to say, that it was reserved for *him* to strip previously existing systems of their more repulsive forms, by investing it which a *new* garb. His system is as follows:—"There is a God; but this God is only the Universality or assemblage of creatures: that every thing is a modification of God; that the *sun* is God, as giving light: that *aliments* are God; as affording nourishment: and so of the rest. For this system however, Spinoza was indebted for the most part to the ancient *pagan* superstitions. One, for instance, struck with the beauty of the stars, said that the *stars* were God. Another, astonished at the splendor of the sun, said that the *sun* was God. Democritus, surprised at the beauty of fire, said that God was a *material fire*. Chrysippus, amazed at the beauty of that necessity which causeth every thing to answer its destination, said, that God was *fate*. Permenides, affected with the beautiful expanse of heaven and earth, said, that God was that *expanse*—and the pagan Demonax (the Grecian philosopher) was once asked to go to the temple of Æsculapius, to supplicate the deity there to restore a sick child to health. "What," replied Demonax, "do you imagine that God is so very deaf, that he can hear you no where else but in the temple?"

But, there is *one defect* about this god of Spinoza. He is destitute of *reason*, of *intelligence*. What—light, or aliments, or the stars, or the sun, or fire, or fate, capable of *thought*? Upon this point, even the most sceptical will not venture a dispute. The

whole universe of created being, inanimate and animate, is constituted of the essence of matter, or of spirit, or of both. By spirit, we mean mind, intellect, soul. That both these essences are common to *all* parts of the created universe, or even to all parts of *animated* nature, is not pretended; the *brutes* which *perish*, in common with *man*, partaking of a *visible body* and *animal life*. If peculiar however to any *one* portion of it, we are furnished with a demonstration of the existence of BOTH. This, then, we assert, is true of MAN. That man is a *complex* being, we thus demonstrate. — He has a *visible body*, material, and, of itself, destructible. Of this, we have the evidence of the senses, which is tangible, irrefragable. But this visible body in man, is endowed with the powers of *motion*, which, for the purpose of distinction we shall call the *animal life*: and which constitutes the *connecting link* between the visible body, and the rational spirit, mind; intellect, soul. This animal life in man, whatever it be, is doubtless, like his body, composed of *matter*, though refined and attenuated to its utmost degree; and, consequently, *invisible* to the eye. Then, upon the same principle that caloric, or heat, is a *material* substance, and, though not visible or tangible, is still possessed of the powers of expansion, emission of light, chemical decomposition, and the like; the inference is drawn, that *life* is a refined, active substance, subject to the laws of matter, and possessing some properties in common with electricity, caloric, light, &c., but yet differing from every other modification of matter; and that, as a conse-

quence, it is equally liable to *decomposition*. With the *rational spirit, mind, intellect, soul*, of man, however, it is otherwise. This property or essence in man, though not palpable to the senses; i. e., though it can neither be seen, felt, heard, smelt, or tasted; yet, from its analogy to some substances strictly material, though not existing in the same degree, it is with equal certainty *known* to exist. "It is agreed, for instance, that a man may *feel* the violence of *heat*, and yet not *see* the principle which communicates it in palpable abstraction before him. "The *wind* bloweth where it listeth, and we *hear* the sound thereof," but its subtle elements remain *invisible* to the eye. "And though it may here be objected, that the evidence of *its* existence is derived from a similar source with that which demonstrates the existence of animal life in man, and that consequently it can differ in no respect from it; and that, as *that* is *material* and *destructible*, so is *this*: we answer, — that the *difference* between them is to be sought, not in the analogical evidence of their mere existence, but in their respective *attributes*. These demonstrate, that they *differ*, essentially, in their *nature*. The *rational spirit* in man is known for instance to possess the faculties of *reason, judgment, the will, the affections, conscience, memory*, and the *imagination*, of all of which the mere animal life in man, and which we admit the lower orders of animal nature inherits in common with him, is totally destitute. This difference constitutes the basis of man's *superiority* to the brute. Animal life, being material, is *destructible*. The

rational soul, being spiritual, is indestructible — not of *itself* — not that it possesses *essential* immortality: no, in this sense, the ETERNAL JEHOVAH alone, who is the fountain of all existence, is immortal. All that is here intended is, that when the Almighty formed the rational spirit in man, his WILL ordained that it should be, imperishable, immortal.

But, as it may be thought that we are anticipating an important conclusion, which ought rather to be proved, than taken for granted, we recall your attention more particularly to a further consideration of the qualities and attributes peculiar to matter. — MATTER, we have said, in the abstract, is destitute of *intelligence*; it cannot beget *thought*. Whatever form matter may assume — however refined or attenuated matter may become — you may make it vast or luminous, opaque or transparent, yet will you never, by all your combinations, advance one single step towards producing among the mighty mass, one spark of latent feeling, or one act of thought.

In meeting the atheistic principle therefore, which asserts that the world which we inhabit is *self-derived*, and consequently eternal, what is the province of *right reason*? It is to argue thus — ‘*I exist*’ — This is self-evident. ‘*I am not the author of my existence.*’ This is also self-evident. ‘*I, therefore, must be a created being.*’ This, also. Hence I argue as follows; That being to whom I owe *my* existence, derives his from himself, or, like me, owes it to *another*. If he exist of himself, he must be the ETERNAL GOD. If not, I argue about *him*, as about

the former. Thus I ascend, thus I am constrained to ascend, till I arrive at that being who *does exist of himself*, and who hath *always so existed*.*

It only remains that I now transfer this species of reasoning from myself as a creature, to the WORLD which I inhabit. My first remark under this category is, that the creation of this material world, argues *design*; design argues *intelligence*. That I am an *intelligent* being, is as *self-evident* as that I *exist*. Now, *whence* this intelligence? Whence is it, that I am endowed with the faculties of *reason*, *judgment*, the *will*, *conscience*, *memory*, and the *imagination*? Then, too, I ask, which is the nobler endowment? The *material*, or the *rational*? And if the *rational*, and, if matter, *of itself*, could not give *existence* to the *former*, how, to the *latter*?

By the same process of reasoning, therefore, as

* "Absolute eternity is necessary in the divine nature, and unavoidably included in the idea of God: He is "from everlasting to everlasting." If there had been a point of duration, wherein there had been no being, there never could have been any being. For how could there have been any thing, if *once* there had been nothing? Could nothing have made any thing, when even God could not make himself? The Christians creed is, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." The Atheist's creed is, "I believe in nothing, the origin of all things." Which do you think is most philosophical?" (Dr. Grosvenor.)

"The late Dr. Nisbet, celebrated for his profound erudition and ready wit, being asked, how he would define modern philosophy, — replied, that "it consists in believing every thing but the truth, and exactly in proportion to the want of evidence; or, to use the words of a poet, 'in making windows that shut out the light, and passages that lead to nothing.'"

adopted under the former argument, I am irresistibly led from myself and nature up to nature's God, and discover in HIM, supreme, infinite, eternal intelligence. And, as such, he is not, upon the atheistic hypothesis of Spinoza, diffused, so to speak, through the various parts of the universe; but, that "he possesseth *all the perfections* of that universe." Yes, "he is the beauty of the stars, the brightness of the sun, the subtlety of etherial matter, the expanse of heaven, and the law of fate." And, "if among these qualities there be any incompatible with the purity of his essence, and therefore inapplicable to him, yet in this sense they belong to him—*all* are subject to his empire, and act only by his will."

Yes, it was by this *self-existent, infinitely intelligent, Eternal, great first cause of all*, even he who is "wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working,"¹ that "the *heavens* were made, and all the *host* of them by the breath (spirit) of his mouth."² "IN (*not before*) THE BEGINNING, GOD CREATED THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH."³ Yes, "He gathered the waters of the *sea* together, as an heap; He layeth up the *deep* as in store-houses."⁴ "Of old hath He laid the foundations of the *earth*."⁵ "In the heavens hath He set a tabernacle for the *sun*."⁶ "He hath appointed the *moon* for seasons,"⁷ and "maketh *Arcturus, Orion and Pleiades*, and the chambers of

1. Isa. xxviii. 19.

2. Ps. xxxiii. 6.

3. Gen. i. 1.

4. Ps. xxxiii. 7.

5. Ps. cii. 25.

6. Ps. xix. 4.

7. Ps. civ. 19.

the south.”¹ “He hath created the *north* and the *south*.”² He maketh “the *weight* for the winds,”³ “and bringeth them out of his treasures.”⁴ “He covereth the heavens with *clouds*,”⁵ “and bindeth up the *waters* with his thick clouds.”⁶ “He made a decree for the *rain*, and a way for the lightning of the thunder;”⁷ “and causeth the *vapors* to ascend from the ends of the earth.”⁸ “The *day* is his, and the *night* also; he hath set all the *borders* of the earth: he has made *summer* and *winter*.”⁹ It was by the word of his mouth that “the **WATERS** were commanded to bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life,”¹⁰ in which “is that *leviathan* he hath made to play therein;”¹¹ also, that “the **AIR** was filled with *fowl* that fly above the earth, in the open firmament of heaven.”¹² And, that “the **EARTH** should bring forth the living creature after his kind, *cattle*, and *creeping things*, and *beasts* of the earth, after his kind;” among which are “*Behemoth*, which eateth grass as an ox.”¹³ By the same word of his power, for the sustenance of **ANIMAL** life, he said, “let the earth bring forth *grass*, and the *herb*, yielding seed after his kind, and the *tree*, yielding fruit; whose seed is in itself, after his kind.”¹⁴ He also

-
- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Job. ix. 9. | 2. Ps. lxxxix. 12. |
| 3. Job. xxviii. 25. | 4. Ps. cxxxv. 7. |
| 5. Ps. cxlvii. 8. | 6. Job. xxv. 8. |
| 7. Job. xxviii. 26. | 8. Jer. x. 13. |
| 9. Ps. lxxiv. 16, 17. | 10. Gen. i. 20. |
| 11. Ps. civ. 26. | 12. Gen. i. 20, 21. |
| 13. Gen. i. 24, 25. Job. xl. 15. | 14. Gen. i. 11, 12. |

made "the *flower* of the field,"¹ and "his voice discovereth the *forest*."² Finally, God created *Man*, in his own image.&c.³

Thus, Christian believer, is it, that our God hath "founded the EARTH upon the seas, and established it upon the floods;"⁴ yea, that "hangeeth the earth upon NOTHING;"⁵ while he, as the great creator of all, "RIDETH IN HIS EXCELLENCY ON THE SKY."⁶ "It was a celebrated saying of Tertullian, that every *mechanic* among Christians *knew* God, and could make him known to *others*. Tertullian thus spoke, by way of contrast to the conduct of the philosopher, Thales, towards Cræsus the king. Cræsus asked this philosopher, "*what is God?*" Thales required *one* day to furnish an answer. Cræsus, receiving no answer, asked him again, "*what is God?*" Thales then asked for *two* days. Failing still to furnish a reply, he asked for *four* days, then for *eight*, then for *sixteen*; until the king, "impatient of further delay, desired to know the reason of it. 'O king, said Thales, be not astonished that I defer my answer. It is a question in which my *insufficient* reason is lost. The oftener I ask myself, *what is God?* the *more incapable* I find myself of answering. *New* difficulties arise every moment, and my knowledge *diminisheth* as my inquiries *increase*."

"Tertullian hereupon takes an occasion to triumph

1. Isa. xl. 6.

3. Gen. i. 26.

5. Job. xxvi. 7.

2. Ps. xxix. 9.

4. Ps. xxiv. 2.

6. Deut. xxxiii. 26.

over the philosophers of paganism, and to make an eulogy on Christianity. Thales, the *Chief* of the wise men of Greece; Thales, who hath added the erudition of Egypt to the wisdom of Greece; Thales cannot inform the king *what* God is! *The meanest Christian*" says he, "*knows more than this.*" "The things of God knoweth no man," only as revealed by "the *Spirit* of God." ¹

Nor can I illustrate this point more pertinently and forcibly, than by calling in the aid of the following incident. "Collins, the *Free-thinker*, met a plain countryman going to church. He asked him, 'where are you going?' 'To church Sir.' 'What to do there?' 'To worship God.' 'Pray, whether is your God a great or a little God?' 'He is both, Sir.' 'How can he be both?' 'He is so great, Sir, that the heaven of heavens cannot contain him; and so little, that he can dwell in my heart.'"

In conclusion, therefore, on this part of our subject, we *deny* the eternity as claimed by atheists, either for the *universe*, as a whole, or for our *globe*, in particular. And that intelligent being, who will withhold the honor and glory due to the Eternal God, by a *denial* that He *created* all, and that He *preserves* and *governs* all, and that He will continue so to do, to the times of the *Restitution* of all things," ²

"—— is mad,
Insane most grievously,
And most insane because he knows it not."

POLLOCK.

1. Corinthian iii. 11. 2. Acts iii. 21.

And, to all, we say, in the language of God to Job, "*Where was thou, when I laid the foundation of the earth? Who hath laid the measures thereof, or who hath stretched the lines upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened, or who laid the corner stone thereof? When all the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?*"

SECTION II.

Thus much for Atheism, whether Christianized, or undisguised. Turn we now to another class of Theorists, who, though they *admit* both the ETERNAL EXISTANCE of the Great-first-cause which we call God, and the work of creating this stupendous universe which we ascribe to him, yet demur, as to *the period of time* which we claim to have elapsed *since* the creation of man, according to the Cosmogony of Moses; and this, in two ways,—

I. By claiming, THAT REMOTE AUTHENTIC ANTIQUITY ASCRIBES A VASTLY GREATER AGE TO THIS GLOBE, THAN THAT SET FORTH BY THE INSPIRED WRITINGS. Here, it would, at first view, seem most befitting that we determine, in round numbers, what is *the present age of the world*, as given in the sacred writings. But, it will equally serve our purpose in this part of the discussion, to assume *any period* this side of eight thousand years. This premised, we proceed to observe, that the ancient Cabalas of the *Hindoos, Egyptians, Chinese, Persians, Etruscans, &c.*

the last of whom, according to Herodotus,¹ colonized Asia minor from Lydia, assigned to the created universe, both prior and subsequent to the existence of the *human* species, periods of stupendous length. Of the extant records of antiquity, those of the sacred law of the *Hindoos* are the oldest; and, whether authentic or fabulous, it serves to furnish us with a nucleus to the notions prevalent among them in regard to the periods of time, both of *energy* and *repose* of the Great Creator, in giving existence to this universe.

These they divide into a *day* and a *night*, both of which are of such vast duration as almost to defy the power of numbers. ²

In Syncellus' account of an old *Egyptian* Chronographeon, (which by the way is very imperfect,³) after assigning an eternity of Existence to *Vulcan*, it claims a period of time for the reign of the kings of Egypt from *Sol* the son of *Vulcan*, to the thirtieth *Tanite* dynasty, of about forty thousand years. ⁴

Similar remote antiquity has been ascribed to the *Chinese* records, but without foundation. ⁵

The *Persian* accounts of their antiquity and learning would carry us back to a period many thousands of years *anterior* to the date above assumed. ⁶

Similar to the above are the accounts of the *Etrus-*

1. Herods Hist., Lib. I. § 94

2. Instit. of Mense, Chap. I. § 64—80.

3. Shuckfords Connections. Vol., III. p., 149, 160.

4. Ibid. p., 129.

5. Shuck, Con. vol., I. p., 48.

6. Faber. Orig., of Pag., Idol. b. I. Zend. avest. vol., iii. Hyde de ler. vet. Pers., p., 161, 162.

*cans.*¹ And, according to Sir Isaac Newton, Diodorus Siculus relates,² "that when Alexander the great was in Asia, the Chaldeans reckoned four hundred and seventy three thousand years, since they first began to observe the stars."

Now, says the *antiquarian*, (not *all* antiquarians.—for many, in their researches into the regions of remote antiquity, have come to a directly contrary conclusion,) the above accounts, *Hindoo, Egyptian, Chinese, Persian*, and *Etruscan*, founded, as they doubtless are, on AUTHENTIC data, and claiming, as they do, such a vastly greater antiquity to the *origin* of the world than that claimed by Moses and the rest of the sacred writers; and, as it is impossible to *harmonize* the latter with the former, it follows that *the Chronology of the Bible* must be, FABULOUS.

Now, in meeting this difficulty, (to many minds, insuperable,) we observe, first, that we *admit* the above accounts, as matters of *historical record*. With the antiquarian however, we claim the right to *demur*. To his *inference*, as predicated of the above accounts as matters of historical record, we *do* demur; yea, more: We DENY, that it is founded in truth. And, as a test to the merits of our denial of the above inference, we shall at once proceed to a *refutation of all claims to a greater antiquity for the origin and duration of this earth, whether Hindoo, Egyptian, Chinese, or other*, than that given in the inspired volume, by establishing an ANTECEDENT ANTIQUITY in behalf of the Sacred writings.

1. Suid. Lex. . 2. Lib. ii., p. 83. Newton's Chron., p. 265.

That such a result is attainable, will appear from a comparison of the antiquity of PROFANE, with the antiquity of the SACRED writings, as based upon their INTERNAL evidence.

To proceed. Besides the sources of remote profane history, denominated *Post-diluvian*, there are some scanty fragments which bear a date *anterior* to the flood: of which, the records of the Egyptian Thyoth and Sanchoniathon of Berytus, form exclusively the basis.¹ The most rigid perspicuity originally formed the principal characteristic in their style of writing. Philo Biblius furnishes us with the following as a specimen. "When Saturnus went to the South, he made Tautus king of all Egypt, and the Cabiri made memoirs of these transactions."²

Now, of these, and the like records of ante-diluvian antiquity, we remark, first, that, in their *uncorrupted* state, they "left accounts very agreeable to that of MOSES;"³ furnishing *collateral* evidence at least, that the *facts* of their history were based upon the *oral traditions* of the *ante-diluvian* patriarchs, with which the history of Moses abounds. To illustrate this point, take the above passage of Philo Biblius, and see how naturally it may be *interwoven* with that of the Sacred writings. "When *Saturnus*" (who was probably the *Mizraim* of the Scriptures) "went to the *South*," (or removed from the *lower Egypt* into *Thebais*,) "he made Tautus king of all Egypt; and the *Cabiri*," (who were the *sons of Mizraim*,) "made memoirs of these transactions."⁴

1. Shuck. con. vol. i. p. 13.

3. Ibid, p. 15.

2. Ibid.

4. Shuck. con. vol. i. p. 13.

Of *ante-diluvian* profane learning, there are no monumental guides upon which, in our inquiries, we can place any reliance. The pillars of Seth, and the Book of Enoch, though supported, the first by Josephus, and the second by Tertullian, and some other fathers, yet seem to have had no existence in fact.¹ And even remote *post-diluvian* history, presents to view a soil of scarcely less sterility. For, though Diodorus assures us that his account of the Assyrian Antiquities is taken from Ctesias, whose records were based upon the *Persian* Chronicles, there can be but little doubt that what he represents as true of the ancient Assyrian Empire, is after all no more than what he *knew* to be true of the Persian.² As Mr. Shuckford justly remarks, those writers seem to have been possessed of "a romantic humor of magnifying ancient facts, buildings, wars, armies, and kingdoms." In illustration of this point we have but to compare the account given of the age of the ante-diluvian kings of Berosus, with the acknowledged longevity of the patriarchs as furnished by Moses. This writer computes each year of the Chaldean kings by a "*Sarus*," each of which is equal to six hundred and three years; and thus he makes them to have lived some "ten, twelve, thirteen, and eighteen Sari, the last of which life amounted to ten thousand, eight hundred and fifty four years."³

Similar to the above are the extravagant accounts of Diodorus and others, who, in after ages, "represent

1. Shuck. con. p. 54, 55. 2. Shuck. con. vol. ii. p. 45, 46.

3. Shuck. con. vol. i. p. 16.

the armies of Semiramis, and her buildings at Babylon, more numerous and magnificent than can be conceived by any one who considers the infant state kingdoms were in when she reigned ;” a correct view of which may be gathered from the circumstance of Abraham’s overthrow of “Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, Tidal, king of nations, Amraphel, king of Shinar, and Arioch, king of Ellasar,” for the capture of his nephew Lot, with no other force but his *three hundred and eighteen armed servants* !¹.

We next observe, that these ancient records, originally simple and concise, soon became *perverted* by the embellishments of *false* learning ; of whom, Surmubelus and Thuero, with the son of Thabio, were the chief instruments : the latter of these, as one of the first interpreters of the Sacra of the Phœnicians, by his comments filled them with *allegory*, and incorporated with them “his *physiological* philosophy, and so left them to the priests, and they to their successors. With these additions and mixtures they came into the hands of the *Greeks*, who were men of an *abounding fancy*, and who, by *new* applications, and by increasing the number and extravagances of the fable, did in time leave but little appearance of truth in them.”

The same remark is applicable to the writings of Sanchoniathon of Berytus, who, we are told, “wrote his history of the Jewish antiquities with the greatest care and fidelity, having received his facts from Hierombalus, a priest, and, having a mind to write a uni-

1. Gen. xiv

versal history of all nations from the beginning, he took the greatest pains in searching the records of Taautus," or Thyoth. "But the priests who lived after him, adding their comments and explications to his work, in some time brought all back to *mythology* again."¹

Profane *post-diluvian* history claims Herodotus as the *first* chronicler of its events. He was followed by Xenophon. Then Ctesias the Cnidian, physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, king of Persia. As evidence of the ancient learning of the Indians, Clemens Alexandrinus quotes the authority of Megasthenes. All the remains of it now extant, however, are to be found in the writings of Confucius. And, though fragments of the most ancient Phœnician, Egyptian, and Grecian writers have been transmitted to us, yet the *original* works, and particularly those of the two former nations, have *perished*.

Upon the history of Herodotus, little, if *any*, reliance can be placed. As himself seems to insinuate, (Lib. i. c. 95,) he wrote from *hearsay* only. In this respect at least, Ctesias had the advantage over him, in that he examined the royal records of *Persia* for historical data, the existence of which records is recognized in the sacred writings. (Ezra iv. 15; Esth. vi. 1.) And, whatever of fable may be attributed to his writings by Aristotle, Antigonus, Caristheus, Plutarch, Arrian, and Photius, no valid objection can be urged against his catalogue of the kings who reigned between

1. 1 Shuck. con. vol. i. p. 13, 14.

the first Assyrian king, Nimrod, and Nabonassar; for, besides the *Scriptural* evidence of such an interval, Ctesias' Catalogue is received as authentic by Diodorus Siculus, by Cephalon, and Castor, by Trogus Pompeius, Valleius Patercules, and afterwards by Africanus, Eusebius, and Syncellus, all of which is corroborated by the observations of Callisthenes, that the Assyrians were promoters of learning during that whole period.¹

It may here be of service to the reader to annex, in addition to the above, the following catalogue of authorities, as the sources, generally, whence are derived the antiquities of the Egyptians, Chinese, and Assyrian dynasties. And,

1. Those of EGYPT are, first, The old Egyptian Chronographeon, which passed through the hands, first of Manetho and subsequently of Syncellus; the latter of which was rather an *abstract* of the original, he having died before completing his account of it.

Then also, even that abstract was incorporated with materials gathered from some later Chronicles.

Of the old Chronographeon, some learned writers, of whom Scaliger is one, are of the opinion that it is nothing but an abridgement of the *Tomes* of Manetho. Prideaux seems to entertain this view. But Syncellus' comparison of the latter work with the former, though it leads to a discovery of errors on the part of Manetho, entirely irreconcilable with the original, yet shows the two works to be separate and distinct; the old

1. Shuck. con. vol. I. p. 13 — 20.

Chronographeon dividing each reign of the Egyptian kings by *astronomical*, and the work of Manetho by *historical* data.

2. The Egyptian Dynasty closed with the reign of Nectanebus, when it fell into the hands of the Persians under the valorous arm of Ochus, and was finally reduced by Alexander the Great. At his death it formed "a part of the provinces of Ptolemy, one of his captains, who in a few years became king of it." It was during the reign of his son Ptolemy Philadelphus, that Manetho, then at the head of the sacra of the Egyptians, and one of the nobility, "about the time, or soon after the Septuagint translation was made of the Hebrew Scriptures, was ordered to compile the history of his own country. Having consulted the sacred books of the Egyptians, and extracted, as he pretended, what had been transcribed into them from their most ancient monuments, and completed his undertaking in the Greek tongue, he dedicated it to Ptolemy, at whose command he had composed it." This, therefore, forms the next source of authoritative data for the antiquities of this nation. The errors and imperfections of his *Tomes*, however, failing to give satisfaction, Eratosthenes was ordered by Ptolemy Euergetes in the following reign, "to make a further collection of the Egyptian kings." Hence,

3. The catalogue of Eratosthenes is now to be added to the above. This writer was a Cyrenian, and, having attained great eminence as a scholar at Athens, the seat of Grecian learning, he was invited into Egypt by Euergetes, where he became one of the keepers

of the Royal Library at Alexandria, and at whose command he furnished a new catalogue of the Egyptian kings. His first business was, to point out the defects of Manetho's work, which had originated after it so early a demand for one of greater accuracy. But, even in this work, though generally esteemed a vast improvement on the former, yet from the great difficulty of preserving accuracy in computing or transcribing the old Egyptian numeral hieroglyphics, errors, to a greater or lesser extent were unavoidable.

4. A fourth source of information in these premises, is some extracts from Manetho in Josephus, relating to the Pastor kings, who, in the reign of Timæus, invaded Egypt, and held it in subjection for five hundred and eleven years. Josephus, however, seems to commit a capital error by including these Pastors in, or as forming part of the Egyptian dynasties; for, they "were not Egyptian; they were foreign invaders, who over-ran Egypt, and reduced a great part of the country into subjection."

5. Following this, is the work of Sextus Julius Africanus of the third century, a Christian, who wrote his "Chronographia" about one hundred and fifty years after Josephus. This work extends from the creation to the consulate of Gratus and Seleucus, to A. D. two hundred and twenty one, and includes the dynasties of Manetho; rejecting, however, all that he "offered of the reigns of gods, demi-gods, and heroes, to be fables, fiction, or false theology, and thereupon superfluous." In this light, the work of Africanus may be viewed as a valuable accession to the history of the times of which it treats, his aim being to reduce

the whole to what he considered "the true chronology of the world."

6. The Chronicon of Eusebius Pamphilius, Bishop of Cæsarea, about a century after, followed that of Africanus. His work commences with the birth of Abraham, and terminates with the 20th year of Constantine the Great. The design of it is, by exhibiting the events of sacred and profane history as cotemporary, to harmonize the one with the other. But in synchronizing these events, he is thought to have taken unwarrantable liberties both with Manetho and Africanus, in the arrangement of his Egyptian dynasties, which greatly diminishes the accuracy, and consequently, the value of his work.

7. The next source of authority respecting the antiquities of Egypt, is, "the chronographia of Syncellus, written A. D. 800; which may be considered as a compilation from all the preceeding, with such departures from, and corrections of each, as his judgment dictated. But this also should be used with great caution; "for, Syncellus had certainly formed no right judgment of the Egyptian history; as appears evidently from his declaring that he knew no use of, nor occasion for, Eratosthene's catalogue of the Theban kings."

8. The last work to which we will refer the reader in this department, is, "the Canon Chronicus of Sir John Marsham." He considered Egypt as being divided into four concurrent kingdoms in the most early ages; viz, — Thebes — This — Memphis — and Tanis, or Lower Egypt. He formed a canon or table,

to give the reader in one view, the cotemporary kings of each kingdom. And, in the execution of his work in proper chapters, he endeavors to justify the position of the kings, according to the succession assigned to them in the successive columns of his canon." And when we reflect, that he has succeeded in reducing the difference in the chronology of events as narrated in sacred and profane history, ending with the passage of the Israelites over the Red Sea, to the narrow point of some *six* or *seven* years, it cannot but strengthen our conviction of the concurrence of the events of profane, with those of the sacred records.

II. Our remarks on the CHINESE records and their antiquities, we shall reserve for a subsequent page.

III. The authorities upon which we are dependant for information respecting the antiquities of the ancient ASSYRIAN empire, are, chiefly, those of Herodotus, Ctesias, Zenophon, Aristotle, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, &c. The *value* of these authorities, however, may be inferred from the fact, that while Sir Isaac Newton and Sir John Marsham on the one hand, contend "that there were no such kings of Assyria, as *all the ancient writers* have recorded to have reigned there, from Ninus to Sardanapalus, and to have governed a great part of Asia for above one thousand three hundred years;" the learned Shuckford on the other, labors to reconcile the conflicting and often contradictory statements with which the writings of the above named ancient authors abound, with the actual existence of said Assyrian kings, from the coincidence of their history with that of the sacred records. For further informa-

tion on *this* interesting subject, together with the preceding, the reader is referred to his connections of sacred and profane history.

With these facts before us, it is easy to discover into what a chaos of perplexity, remote *profane* history is involved. But, this circumstance we think may be satisfactorily accounted for, from the very structure peculiar thereto. Take, for example, that of the ancient Egyptian dynasty. First, in order, follows an account of their gods; then of their demi-gods and heroes, and finally, of their kings.¹ To their heroes, at a very early period of their history, they appended the names of their sidereal and elementary deities, the philosophical opinions concerning whom, in their subsequent mythological accounts, were transferred to the life and actions of the *heroes* themselves. This circumstance soon induced a departure from the once-unadorned style of imparting religious instruction to the common people, and a substitution in its place of an ambitious desire to cater to the appetites of the fastidious.² Hence, the vagaries of a fanciful mythology and philosophy, soon obscured the unsophisticated facts of *primitive* profane history. And, as we advance from the period of the second Thyoth or Hermes, to the times when Grecian philosophy became ascendant, the disposition to pander to the appetite of human intellectuality, both in *perverting*, as above, the plainest historical facts, and in *originating*

1. Shuck. Con. vol. I., p. 43, 44.

2. See on this subject, Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. I., c. 10.

systems of physiological science in the place of what had been previously received as decisive on the ground of oral patriarchal tradition, obtained the ascendancy.

In regard to the original invention of *Letters*, while some ascribe it to Adam, and others to Abel; Pliny,¹ as founded without doubt upon the notion that the world was eternal, in one place hints that letters were eternal; but his general opinion was, that they were of *Assyrian* origin.² And, while Philo Biblius, Diodorus,³ Plutarch,⁴ Cicero,⁵ Tertullian,⁶ Plato, &c., all ascribe them to Thyoth or Taausus of Egypt;⁷ yet "considering that mankind was not planted first in Egypt, after the flood, but emigrated thither from Assyria; and that a very few years after the dispersion, astronomical calculations (which argue the use of letters) were made in Babylon, the latter conclusion would seem the most rational. And then, with whom originate more probably than with ΝΟΑΗ, the father and founder of the *New* world, if indeed they were not, as Shuckford thinks, of ante-diluvian origin.⁸ That they were used in Assyria before the time of Abraham, and in Egypt before the time of

1. Lib. vii., c. 56.

2. Ibid.

3. Diodor. l. i., § 16., p. 10.

4. Sympos. l. ix., c. 3.

5. Lib de Nat. Deor. iii., § 22.

6. Lib. de corona militis. c. 8;
et de Testim. Animæ; c. 5.

7. "By the books of Taausus, Shuckford supposes are meant pillars, or lumps of earth with inscriptions on them, books not being invented in these early days."

8. Shuck. Con. vol. i., p. 142.

Moses, there can be no doubt. And Scaliger, Vossius, and Bochart have proved beyond contradiction, that the Assyrian, Syrian, Canaanitish, Phœnician, and Hebrew letters were all nearly the same. But,

It is here objected, that the Egyptian *Hieroglyphics* are the most antique letters extant. To this, however, it is replied, 1st., that the Menes of Diodorus, and other heathen writers, and the Mestram of Syncellus, who with Herodotus,¹ Eratosthenes, Africanus, and Eusebius, acknowledge to have been the *first king of Egypt*, is the same with the *Mizraim* of Moses, as the coincidence of the sacred and profane narratives as shown by Sir John Marsham fully demonstrates.² Whether he was present at the building of *Hebron*, situated between Shinaar and Egypt, seems uncertain; but that city was built seven years before *Zoan* in Egypt.³ Canaan, therefore, was settled even *before* Egypt. The Timaus also of Plato, who is the same with the Mizraim of Moses, that writer says reigned over all Egypt; ⁴ and, after leaving Zoan at the entrance of Egypt where he first settled, he penetrated farther into the interior, and built Thebes and Memphis.⁵ To this we add, 2nd., that though the Egyptians at an early period fell into Idolatry, yet it appears that in the time of Abraham, they were worshippers of the true God, he having been received and entertained in Egypt the same as at Gerar.⁶ This

1. Lib. ii., § 4.

3. Num. xiii. 22.

5. Herod. lib. ii., § 99.

2. Canon Chronicon. p. 22.

4. In Phædro. p. 1240.

6. Gen. xii. 14, and xx. 1, 2, &c.

fact is also confirmed by the testimony of Plutarch,¹ Philo Biblius,² and Porphyry.³ It is evident, therefore, 3rd., that hieroglyphics were not in use in the days of Abraham; and to this we may add another fact, viz., that the pillars upon which Hermes or Taautus "left his memoirs, were inscribed, not in hieroglyphics, but *ισρογραφικαῖς γραμμασι*, in the *sacred letters*, in letters which were capable of being made use of by a translator, who turned what was written in these letters out of one language into another."⁴ These sacred letters, however, fell into entire desuetude before the time of Diodorus; but Dr. Burnet⁵ and bishop Stillingfleet both contend, that the sacred letters of the Egyptians were *different* from their hieroglyphics; and also that, unlike the Chinese letters, which express no words, or particular sounds whatever, they were capable of expressing words of different languages.⁶

It is, however, further urged, that the rudeness of Egyptian sculpture is an evidence of their great antiquity; while, on the other hand it is contended, that, for the most part, these figures were evidently made after the Greeks and Romans broke in upon the Egyptians; and further, that, whereas their ancient images represented *animals* of various sorts, e. g., a hawk for Osiris, a sea-horse for Typho, a dog for

1. Plut. de Iside et Osi. p. 359.

2. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. i., c. 10.

3. Ibid. lib. iii., c. 11.

4. Shuck. Con. vol. ii., p. 200. Euseb. in chron. p. 6.

5. Archaeolog.

6. Shuck. Con. vol. i., p. 147.

Mercury, a cat for the moon, &c., their modern relics are mostly of the *human* shape. True, judging from the figures in F. Montfaucon's collection, the rudeness of their shape indicates great antiquity. But "Plato expressly tells us, that it was a rule among their statuary, to imitate the antique shapes of the ancient patterns, and that the carvers were *by law*, restrained from all attempts which looked like innovation."¹

However much of incertitude, therefore, may accompany all our researches into remote antiquity in these premises, we think that we are warranted in deciding against the high claims thereto, on the part of ancient Egypt. The invention of letters is of Assyrian, not Egyptian origin. Menes, Mestram, or Timaus, the first king of Egypt, is the Mizraim of Old Testament History. The origin of Egyptian hieroglyphics is evidently *posterior* to the time of Abraham, letters having been introduced *anterior* both to Abraham and Moses. And if it be true, as Scaliger, Casaubon, Grotius, Vossius, Bochart, Father Morin, Brerewood, Capellus, and Bishop Walton, contend, that the *old* Hebrew characters² were the same, or nearly the same as the Phœnician,³ Syrian, Assyrian, and Canaanitish; and also that the Egyptian were totally

1. Plato de Legibus. Lib. ii., p. 789.

2. These, "the Rabbins, Talmudists, Christian Fathers, Origen and St. Jerome, all believed have undergone a change, supposed to have been made by Ezra, after the rebuilding of the temple, when he wrote out a *new* copy of the law." (*Shuck.*)

3. See specimens of them in Shuckford's Con. vol. i., pp. 151 — 164.

separate and distinct from the Chinese, it is natural to conclude that they must have been similar to the above. This would also seem subversive of the theory, that the Hebrew characters were first inscribed by the finger of God upon the two tables of stone on the holy mount, as predicated of the supposition, that, if written in the characters then known in Egypt, they must have tended to encourage that very idolatry prohibited in the second commandment; inasmuch as the *mythology* of that nation at that time pervaded the entire body of their hieroglyphics. Incorporated, however, with these very hieroglyphics,¹ were letters (which could have been none other than their sacred letters²) explanatory of them; their extremely rude and uncouth forms rendering them for the most part otherwise unintelligible. This we say was indispensable, in order "to fill up and connect sentences, and to express actions." Hence, "the first man must have had *letters* as well as *pictures*, or their pictures could have hinted only the ideas of visible objects; but there would have been much wanting in all inscriptions to give their full and true meaning."³ Even admitting, then, as history indicates,⁴ that Egyptian learning in the time of Moses was at an exceeding low ebb, and that their astron-

1. These hieroglyphics were something like Pythagoras's precepts, they expressed one thing, but meant another." Plut. lib. et Iside et Osiride., p. 354.

2. See p. 32.

3. Shuck. Con. vol. ii., p. 201.

4. Marsham Con. Chron. p. 137.

omy, even before his day had led them into idolatry ; it no more follows that Moses was *ignorant* of the Hebraic Egyptian sacred letters, than that himself had become an idolator. Nor can it seem less than extraordinary, that scripture no where intimates such a *miraculous* origin of the Hebrew characters as above intimated ; since, in the erection of the Jewish tabernacle and temple, and every thing connected with the whole paraphernalia of their priesthood, sacrifices, and ritual service, God said to Moses, “see thou make *all things* according to the pattern showed to thee *in the mount*.”¹ As will hereafter be seen, we are no advocates for *superfluous* miracles.

As it regards the invention of letters, therefore, as already intimated,² with whom originate more probably than with NOAH, if indeed they were not, as the learned Shuckford thinks, of ante-diluvian origin. The Chinese ascribe the invention of their letters to their first emperor Fohi. Now, that this Fohi and Noah was one and the same person, we think will appear evident from the following. The Chinese say of their Fohi, that he had no father, which, in respect to them, was the case with Noah, their traditional records containing no accounts of his ancestry. They have a tradition of the rainbow, which they say surrounded the mother of Fohi at his conception. This answers to the “rainbow” of the Noahic covenant.³ Fohi, they say, sacrificed seven sorts of creatures to the supreme spirit of heaven and earth.

1. Exod. xxv. 9, 40.

2. See p. 30.

3. Gen. ix. 11—15.

Noah took with him into the ark both of clean beasts and fowls by sevens, which, after the subsiding of the waters of the flood, he offered in sacrifice to God,¹ &c. This analogy between their *traditions* and the *facts* of the sacred records might easily be extended,² but the above are deemed sufficient for our present purpose; which is simply to demonstrate that the antiquities of China reach no further back than the times of Noah, the difference between their chronology and that of the sacred text, according to their own writers, coinciding very nearly therewith.³

And, what is true of the Chinese Fohi, is true also of the Indian Bacchus, a name which originated first in India. "He was the first who pressed the grapes and made wine."⁴ He lived in these parts before there were any cities in India. They say that he was twice born,"⁵ &c., all of which is signally applicable to Noah.

As most of my readers are doubtless more or less familiar with the coincidence of the antiquities of the Assyrian empire with those of the sacred Annals, I shall not detain them with any further amplifications of the subject in the department of *history*; but shall proceed at once to a further confirmation of the precedence of sacred over that of profane antiquity, by a comparison of the various systems of ancient *profane*,

1. Gen. vii. and viii.

2. See Martinii Hist. Sinica. p. 11; Le compte, mem. of China, p. 313; Couplets Confucius, Proæm. p. 38, 76.

3. Shuck Con. vol. i., p. 48.

4. Gen. ix. 20.

5. Shuck. Con. vol. ii., p. 74.

physiological philosophy, with the cosmogony of Moses.

Of the PHILOSOPHERS of various ancient nations, — Orpheus, Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, were the most eminent. Pherecydes, Anaximander, Anaximines, and Anaxigorus, were mere *copyists*; nor was any thing like a rational system of natural science concocted, till the days of Leucippus and Democritus. But, of these, and with them, the whole world of ancient philosophers it may be said, that, when once they ventured beyond the bounds of their *traditionary* knowledge, by which means they had been enabled for ages to retain a tolerably correct idea of many important truths, and threw themselves upon an attempt to ORIGINATE systems of philosophy by which to account for the *how* and the *wherefore* of long-received and established principles, they went *beyond themselves*, and were *soon* bewildered in the mists of vain speculations. True, in the departments of *geometry*, *astronomy*, *physics*, and some other arts, the Egyptians from an early period had formed some tolerably correct notions. But in *physiology*, they contented themselves to receive what was handed down to them by their ancestors, and out of the treasures of *their* traditions, to instruct others; not by the process of individual philosophical *experiments*, but by the established rule, “ask, and it shall be *told* you; search the records of *antiquity*, and you shall find what you inquire after.”

Nor were the systems of ancient philosophy at all controverted, till the introduction of the science of

physiology into Greece, by the poets Hesiod, Homer, Linus, and some others. Of the "eminent masters" of Greece, from Pherecydes to Aristotle, an interval of about three hundred years, Thales, Pythagorus, and Aristotle only can be named; and it is remarkable, that even they did not *invent* that part of their philosophy of which I am treating, but travelled for it, and collected it from the records of *other* nations.

In connection with this subject we have further to observe, that it is no less extraordinary than true, that of all the philosophical speculations of ancient Greece, their physiological discoveries almost invariably excluded a recognition of the Great First Intelligent Cause. Even Aristotle, who "rejected the ancient traditional knowledge, thinking it unbecoming a philosopher to offer opinions to the world, which he could not prove to be true," fell equally short with his predecessors of the same school, in producing "a well-grounded theory of natural knowledge."¹

If asked, "whence has arisen the high and widespread reputation which has long crowned the name of Aristotle?" we answer, it "is to be traced principally to the occupations of the Scholastics of the middle ages, a body of men whose existence, origin, and influence, were based on superstition, ignorance, and bigotry alone; and whose members occupied their time in distorting, magnifying, and perverting the language of the Holy Scriptures, and in inventing shackles and fetters for the human understanding,

1. Shuck. Con. I., p. 31.

which have continued ever since in a great degree to bind it, and must still do so until the diffusion of knowledge and of judicious education shall counteract the efforts of interested hypocrisy and imposition. The admiration of Aristotle's name and doctrines is principally to be ascribed to the fondness of these "illustrious" and "illuminated" doctors for idle logomachies and dialectic subtilities ;" his doctrine consisting rather "of *Words* than of *Things*," and consequently is "dialectic and disputatious, rather than practically useful and beneficial." ¹

He divided his system "into two branches, — the THEORETICAL and the PRACTICAL, each of these comprising several distinct and very different subjects. Thus the *theoretical* embraces *physics*, *metaphysics*, *logic*, and *mathematics* ; — and well might it be called *theoretical*, for the notions of Aristotle were founded upon mere fanciful speculations, without reference to facts, and without being the result of any series of scientific induction. It is only when we perceive, through the intricate jargon which he employed, *the portions which he borrowed from some previous school*, that we discover any approach to truth or to accurate research."

We now ask, therefore, in that part of his theoretic philosophy which included the department of PHYSICS, what were the views entertained and taught by him of the SUPREME BEING? "What were the attributes which *he* ascribed to God? Ans. — He

1. Prog. of Philos. pp. 337, 338.

regarded him solely as the *cause of motion* ; the attributes which he ascribed to him were solely those of a Being, immoveable, eternal, indivisible, and incorporeal ; *inactive* himself, yet *causing motion*, — not *voluntarily*, but by *necessity* ; not the *creator* of the world, but *co-eternal* with it ; happy only in the contemplation of himself ; not taking cognizance of, and not regarding the affairs of the world, which owed not its existence to him, and to which his presence and influence do not extend ; which must be, indeed, far beyond his view, his observation, or his care ! ” ¹

Nor do we rest this representation of the doctrine of Aristotle respecting the Deity, as extracted from various portions of his writings, on our own authority alone. Cicero, two thousand years ago, speaking of Aristotle in connection with this part of his system, says, “at one time he assigns all the attributes of divinity to the *mind* alone ; at another time he tells us that the *world itself* is God. Here he speaks of something superior to the world, and assigns to it the office of ruling and directing the *motion* by which the changes of the world are effected, — while there, we are told that God is but the ‘ardor’ — the *motive power* of heaven, — not remembering that the heaven itself is but a part of that world, which we had, been previously informed was God.” ² To this Cicero further adds, that Aristotle considered the world to be eternal in duration, having had no begin-

1. Prog. of Philos. pp. 337, 338, 345 — 347.

2. Prog. of Philos. p. 349. De. nat. Deor. I., § 13.

ning, and being subject to no end. The three principles of all things are, according to his system, *matter*, *form*, and *privation*; the two former essential to the constitution of all things, and the latter entering *accidentally*, — as he termed it, — into their composition, whence they undergo a change of form.¹

On the other hand, it will be found upon examination, that “those philosophers who *preceded* Aristotle, regarded the Deity as the Supreme Being; as infinite in power, and majesty, and goodness; as ordering and directing the affairs of men; and as the author of all that has existence.”² How then, it will be asked, are we to account for these marked differences in their respective systems? This, we reply, is obvious. The former was satisfied to receive as *traditional truth*, that system of philosophy which their capacities of reason, or means of knowledge, could neither refute nor improve. And, as we have demonstrated, that neither Adam nor Moses could have derived this knowledge without a *direct revelation from God*, all the ancient heathen nations must have received their traditions from the Hebrews. Nor will this be questioned for a moment, provided, upon a comparison of the matter of fact history of the creation as given by Moses, with the most ancient systems of heathen philosophy, there can be traced any tolerable marks of correspondence.

The Egyptians, Diodorus Siculus informs us, affirmed, that in the beginning the heavens and the

1. Ibid. p. 349, 350.

2. Ibid. p. 346.

earth were in one lump, mixed and blended together in the same mass. By the heavens, the Egyptians understood simply "the air and planetary regions belonging to our world; for the *first* Greeks, who received their learning from *Egypt*, agree very fully with Moses in this point. "In the beginning," says Orpheus, "the heavens were made by God, and in the heavens there was a chaos, and a terrible darkness was on all the parts of this chaos, and covered all things under the heaven;" (See Gen. i., 1, 2.) by which he meant, as Syrian observes, that "the heavens and the chaos were the *principia*, out of which the rest were produced." So "Anaxagorus," who, with the most of the ancient writers, begin their accounts of the origin of the material heavens and earth from the commencement of their *organization*, as Laertius informs us, begins his book, — "All things were at first in one mass, but an intelligent agent came and put it in order."¹ With this agrees Aristotle, who, as we have said, when borrowing from a *previous* school, approaches to truth. "All things," says he, "lay in one mass for a vast space of time, but an intelligent agent came and put them in motion, and so separated them from one another."² So of Sanchoniathon, when divested of "the mythology and false philosophy which those who lived after him added to his writings." He taught, "that there was a dark and confused chaos, and a blast of wind or air to put it in a ferment or agitation," by which word "wind"

1. Shuck. Con. I., p. 23.

2. Ibid.

ανεμος πολπια Mr. Shuckford contends he meant, not the wind *Colpia*, but ανεμος *Col-pi-jah*, i. e., the wind or breath of the voice of the mouth of the Lord; and," adds he, "if this was his meaning, he very emphatically expresses God's making all things with a word, and intimates also what the Chaldee paraphrase insinuates from the words of Moses, that the chaos was put into its first agitation by a mighty and strong wind."¹

The Greek writer Thales was of the opinion, "that the first principle of all thing was υδως, or water," which opinion is confirmed by the testimony of Tully. Thales, however, with all the ancient philosophers used the word water in the sense of "Chaos, from χεω, the Greek word which signifies *diffusion*; so that the word Chaos was used ambiguously, sometimes as a proper name, and sometimes for water," or, "a fluid substance." "From Plutarch's observation, Thales', υδως (*water*) was not pure elementary water." "Thus Sanchoniathon argues; from Chaos he supposes muddy matter to arise; and thus Orpheus, out of the fluid Chaos, arose a muddy substance; and Apollonius, out of the muddy substance the earth was formed, i. e., says the scholiast, the Chaos, of which all things were made, was a fluid substance, which, by settling, became mud, and that in time dried and condensed into solid earth. It is remarkable that Moses calls the Chaos, *water*, in this sense; "the spirit of

1. Ibid. p. 23, 24.

God," he says, moved upon the face of the *main*, waters, or fluid matter."¹

To what conclusion, then, we ask, do these facts conduct us? The facts we mean, first, of the knowledge of the science of physiology by the ancients through the medium of tradition; and second, of the utter failure of all the philosophers of Greece, even Aristotle not excepted, to originate any new system, which, so far from proving the fallacy of the old traditional philosophy, could not even give a reasonable account of the first principles of which it was constructed. The inevitable conclusion is, *that the principles of the old traditional philosophy lay entirely beyond the discoveries of Human Reason*. On this ground, what was true of Thales, Pythagorus, and Aristotle, was true also of Moses, familiar as he doubtless was in his knowledge of the Egyptian philosophy. Nor did he in his cosmogony attempt to account for the *how* and the *wherefore* of things — that account being "a bare recital of facts." The facts, therefore, as related by Moses, must have been imparted to him by Divine Revelation, or else he must have received them from his ancestors. And, if we adopt the latter hypothesis, and inquire, from whom did they receive their information, a few generations conduct us back to the first man Adam. But even here, we must encounter the same difficulties as at the first. For we ask, "*whence* had *he* this knowledge?" Could he, by his own reason, account for "the man-

ner of his 'own creation," with that of the primordial Chaos and the formation of the material earth and heavens, both of which existed *before* he had any being?

"A due consideration of these things must lead us to believe, that God at first revealed these things unto men; that *He* acquainted them with what He had done in the creation of the world: and what He had thus communicated to them, they transmitted to their childrens children. Thus God, *who in these last days hath spoken to us by His son*, did in the beginning in some extraordinary manner speak unto our fathers; for there was a stock of knowledge in the world, which we cannot see how the possessors could possibly have obtained in any other way. Therefore, fact as well as history, testifies, that the notion of a Revelation is no dream; and that Moses, in representing the early ages of the world as having had converse with the Deity, does no more than what the state of their knowledge obliges us to believe."¹

Thus, therefore, as we flatter ourselves, have we clearly demonstrated the superiority of the claims of Moses as an historian, to guide our subsequent investigations; and this, as predicated of the argument of *greater antiquity* than that of any other writer extant; proof being principally derived from the *internal evidence*, that their productions, so far as connected with the science of physiology, were borrowed from the sacred records of the Hebrews.

1. Shuck. Con. I., pp. 31—33.

To sum up the whole, therefore, in few words, it would seem that, with the exception of what is claimed in behalf of Thyoth and Sanchoniathon of Berytus, *sacred* history claims a priority over that of *profane*, by a period of about three thousand three hundred years. *Herodotus* is the earliest post-diluvian profane historian extant. He flourished about one thousand years *after* the Jewish historian Moses, and about five hundred years before Christ; and the chronology of his history bears date only about seven hundred years prior to that event.

At this stage of our advance, and as appropriate to the subject in hand, we would respectfully submit, whether, what is claimed by the Antiquarian as applicable to the age of the world from the creation and fall of man, is not strictly true of those periods which elapsed during the week of creation and of formation of the material universe, as designed to be set forth in the Mosaic cosmogony of that event. The affirmative of this position sustained, it will, if we mistake not, reflect material light on the preceding, in as much as it will discover the grounds of those errors into which the ancient profane historian was betrayed; which was, that of confounding the evident remote antiquity which stamped the works of nature, with those oral traditionary historic facts, as above represented.

SECTION III.

With this intimation in view, and without further delay, we now state, that, in Scripture, various forms of speech are employed to designate **TIME**; one of which is the term "day," used in the first chapter of Genesis to denote the length of the Great Creator's week of labor and of repose. "The *evening* and the *morning* were the **FIRST, SECOND, THIRD day,**"¹ &c. The question respecting this term as above, is, whether it is a *natural* or *solar* day of *twenty-four hours*, or a period of *vastly greater length*.

In conducting our inquiries in reference to this interesting subject, we observe that, reasoning *analogically*, Nature and Providence are gradual in their operations; not like man, who is always for subitaneous violence, but deliberately proceeding, by gradual evolutions, as illustrated in the physical and intellectual powers of man, to unfold to our view the properties, first, of matter; and then of mind.

In accordance, therefore, with this principle, we now proceed to demonstrate, *a posteriori*, as founded upon the physiological and oryctological discoveries of science, that the six days of creation, as mentioned in the history of Moses, *were periods of stupendous length* — and,

I. Presumptive evidence of this fact we think may be fairly drawn, from a more extended survey of the work of *formation* attributed to each of the six days.

1. Gen. i. 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31. Chap. ii. 2.

1. The work of the *first day* was the separation of light from darkness—the Hebrew word אֹר *or*, translated *light*, Parkhurst defines to be the celestial fluid in a state of activity. חֹשֶׁךְ *wechoshech*, rendered *darkness*, the same celestial fluid in an inactive state. It was from this crude aqueous matter, (which, in its inactive state, constituted the darkness which enveloped the primeval chaos, and which preceded the existence of light,) by being subjected to the energies of the Divine Spirit, that its inherent igneous properties were thrown off, and when collected into one body, constituted light: the residuum, — darkness.* The work of this first day, is to be carefully distinguished from that of the *fourth*, which was appropriated to the formation of the sun, moon, and stars.

2. The *second day* was appropriated to the separation of *air* and *water*. The original word, רָקִיָּא *rakia*, signifies *air*, or the *expansion*, a gaseous fluid, and not *firmament*, as in the English version, which is taken from the Septuagint. This constituted the next step of advance in the organization of the chaotic aqueous matter. For, till there was an *expansion*, or *atmosphere*, the particles of water thrown off

* "It seems to me most rational," says Bishop Patrick, "by this *light* to understand those particles of matter which we call *fire*, (whose properties every one knows are *light* and *heat*,) which the Almighty Spirit, that formed all things, produced as the great instrument for the preparation and digestion of the rest of the matter; which was still more vigorously moved and agitated, from the top to the bottom, by this restless element, till the purer and more shining parts of it, being separated from the grosser, and united in a body fit to retain them, became light."—*Com. on Gen. i. 1–3.*

by the continued action of fire on the primeval elements, could not ascend. This expanse provided, the process of evaporation could go on, the smaller particles being raised above by exhalation, and the larger body of water remaining below. Thus the atmosphere, and which is the same with the material heaven, through which the birds of the air wing their devious course, "divided the waters which were above them,* from the waters which were below them."

3. On the *third day*, sea and land were disunited, and the earth was made to produce *vegetation*. Each successive process in the conformation of the primeval aqueous matter to the purposes designed, should be sedulously kept in view. The chaotic elements had by the organization of the first two days, produced successively and in the following order, darkness, light, the atmosphere, and a division of the exhaled particles of water, from the denser fluid. This fluid, however, was subjected to another process,—that of bringing together its granitic and earthy elements; the former constituting the primitive rock or skeleton of our globe, the latter, the soil with which they were covered, as indispensable to the purposes of vegetation. Hence the division of earth and water, or sea and land, and the production of grass, herbs, and trees.

It might here be asked, how, without the genial warmth of the sun, &c., could the surface of the earth

* It has been demonstrated that of the exhaled watery particles which float in the air, there is an average of about four hundred weight to every square yard of the earth's surface.

be productive of the various vegetable tribes? The answer is, that as the chaotic aqueous matter, in its ACTIVE state, partook of the properties of *heat* as well as *light*, so, "as in a hot-house, germination would proceed without interruption." But,

4. On the *fourth day*, a more perfect division of darkness and light into day and night was produced, by placing in the material heavens, the *sun*, the *moon*, and the *stars*. This was the first division of "the evening and the morning" of the three preceding days, into *natural* day and night. Thenceforward, the diurnal revolutions of the earth on its axis, and the lunar and solar revolutions of the sun and moon, established the divisions of time into days, months, and years, and the seasons into those of summer and winter.

5. The formation, first of fishes, and second, of birds, the products of the waters, constituted the work of the *fifth day*.

6. The work of the *sixth day* was appropriated to the formation, first, of the various species and genus of beasts and reptiles, and finally, of MAN. And,

7. The *seventh day* was A SABBATH OF REST.

In conducting our inquiries in reference to the question at issue, we shall be compeled to wander rather beyond the common beaten track, and argue, *a posteriori*, as an aid to our conceptions of the probable time, during which the primordial elements remained in their *chaotic* state, subject to the agency of the Divine Spirit. Also, *a priori*, as estimated by the *general alalogy* of the works and word of God, as

unfolded in nature and providence, as the mode of determining the length of each creative day. Reasoning analogically, as we have once before remarked, nature and providence are "*gradual*" in their operations; not like "man," who is always for subitaneous violence; but deliberately proceeding, by "*gradual evolutions*," as illustrated in the physical and intellectual powers of man, to unfold to our view the properties, "first of matter, and then of mind."

Now, take a view of the vastness of the material universe of God, and I ask if there be any thing *unreasonable* in the conception of the *possibility*, that a greater period of time than that of six natural days of twenty-four hours each, was occupied in their formation? and if not, then arguing *a posteriori*, may we not attribute a period of proportionable, though of course indefinite amplitude, to the existence of the chaotic elements?

Without further preliminaries, we now observe, that in reference to this subject, there are four classes of opinions:

The first (and the popular opinion) excludes all distinction between the act of creation and that of formation; and assigns six natural days, of twenty-four hours each, to the production of the material universe.

The second admits the above distinction, and, like the first class, assigns six natural days, of twenty-four hours each, to the organization of the primeval aqueous matter; but asserts a previous organization to that of the six days, of vast, but indefinite length.

The third also admits the above distinction; but

extends the six days to six periods, each of immense, though of various and indefinite length ; and,

The fourth, which is the standard adopted in this Essay, the same as the third, with the exception that it prefers to equalise the time allotted to each period.

Before we proceed, however, to an examination, upon the basis of Scripture, of these several theories, it will be well to notice the expositions of that class of critics who assign an existence, *prior* to that of the earth, to other planets or worlds, which compose our astronomical system. The hypothesis assumed by these critics is as follows, viz. : That the chaotic mass out of which this earth was formed, was produced by the destruction of one of the previously existing planets, by the shock of some comet.

Names, ancient and modern, and preferring high claims to our regard, are quoted in support of this system. Basilius, Archbishop of Cæsarea, towards the close of the fourth century, in his commentary on Genesis, says, it is probable that something of creative nature existed *before this World*, though no narrative of it is furnished. Smith and Jennings follow Hally, the author of the above system, in the particular form in which it is there given ; and with this harmonizes the claims of the celebrated Herschel, of having discovered, by his great telescope, that there are stars, the light of which has been two millions of years in its progress to our earth ; which opinion is also adopted by Mr. Vince, the professor of Astronomy in the University of Cambridge.

The principal arguments adduced in support of this hypothesis, are,

1. That the cosmogony of Moses contemplates simply a history of the *origin* of the human species; all the other parts thereof being incidental. But, to our apprehension, this argument is irrelevant, and tends only to derogate from the wisdom and power of the Almighty, as displayed in the creation and formation of the material universe. True, the human species constitute the *noblest* part of God's handy-work; true, also, the earth was created as the *abode* of man. Taking the history, however, as it stands, and we see not why one event, as therein narrated, is not relatively as important as the other. The cosmogony of Moses was designed to furnish an account of the *origin of the material universe*, of which *man*, so far as it respects his *animal* nature, *forms a part*. Man's superiority, when compared with the other parts of the material world, consists in his endowment of a nature, of qualities, of attributes, *not inherent* in matter. He is a spiritual, immortal being — not that he possesses essential immortality; but only as it is the gift of his Creator — nor, after his sin, did this supernatural endowment shield him from the curse, "*from dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.*"

2. Job, chap. xxxviii. 4 — 7, is quoted in proof of the existence of *other* parts of the creation *before* this globe. The veriest tyro, however, upon the face of that passage cannot but perceive that God is addressing himself to Job out of the whirlwind, demanding to know if *he* were present either at the *creation* or

organization of the material heavens and earth. "The sons of God": here spoken of, interpreters generally understand to be, that order of *intelligent* agents, called *angels*, the priority of whose existence to that of the material universe, or of man, none deny. "The morning stars," however, are quoted as decisive proof that there were pre-existent *planets* as well as angels. In proof, it is asserted that the 14th verse of the 1st chap. of Genesis, "Let there be light in the firmament of heaven," does not refer to the primary organization of the sun, moon, and stars, &c., but to a *clearing* in the superincumbent atmosphere of our globe, so as to render them *visible*! Now, to this we remark, that all that is said of the organization of light, and the formation of the planetary system, the sun, moon, and stars, relate to the *first* and *fourth* days. On the *second* day the *air*, or atmospheric expanse was formed, and which is represented to have been cleared of its superincumbent qualities, in order to expose to view the previously invisible planets. But we ask, was it on the *first* or the *fourth* day that the planets were *first* formed? Certainly the latter. See verses 14 — 16. And that they were so formed *primarily* on the *fourth* day, and not on the *first*, is incontrovertibly demonstrated by the 17th and 18th verses, where we read, "And God וַיֵּצֵא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְאֶת הַיָּרֵחַ SET them (the sun, moon, and stars,) in the firmament of heaven," for the express purpose that they might "give *light* upon the *EARTH*, and to rule over the *day* and over the *night*, and to *DIVIDE* the *light* from the *darkness*." This had not been done on the *first* day. All that was then accom-

plished was a separation of the elements of light and darkness, produced by the action of fire on the aqueous congeries.

Still it is said, in proof, that the earth we inhabit is merely a *resuscitated* globe, and that it had been a world *many ages* before it became the abode of man ;

3. That the passage rendered, "and the earth *was* without form and void," may be rendered, "*but* the earth *became* a ruin and a desolation." To this rendering we oppose the following—"And the earth was [as] a *ruin* and a *desolation*;" i. e., in appearance it resembled a vast city buried in ruins, and covered with desolation. With this agrees not only our excellent English version, but also the Septuagint and the Vulgate; the former of which has "ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἄσπετος," and the latter, "*terra autem ERAT inanis et vacua.*" Of those of more modern date, Luther renders it, "*waste and empty*;" Le Sage, "*a solitude and desert*;" Gaddes, "*desolate and waste.*" It is also worthy of remark, that with these renderings agree the original עֵרָא וְתוֹהוּ translated, "the earth," which with its root, signifies swift motion, indicative of that tremulous, confusedly agitated motion to and fro, of the earthly matter, (q. d. *the rushing chaos*,) the *terra prima*, the semi-formative of the world, as yet in embryo, and as having just received the impulsive *fiat* of its great Creator, who

"Nor stay'd, but on the wings of cherubim
Uplifted, in *paternal glory* rode
Far into *chaos*, and the world *unknown.*"

This, we say, seems the most natural and obvious construction of the subject in hand. It divests it of all reasonable objection, and at the same time furnishes us with a "simple, intellectual, easily conceivable view of the chaotic *basis* of the *future* world;" and with the Scriptures as our guide, "may we not humbly conceive of the Almighty as first speaking the *elements* into existence *together*, in one general conglomerated mass, and then *afterwards* imparting to *each* its respective appropriate qualities, &c. When

"Confusion heard his voice, and wild uproar
Stood rul'd."

Let us now return to the four theories which prevail, in reference to the length of the six days mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis.

In regard to the *first* of these four theories, with the exception that it harmonizes with the latter part of the *second*, in reference to its allotment of six natural days as the time of organization, there is no agreement between it and the other three; they all admitting the distinction between the works of CREATION and of FORMATION. This point, therefore, first demands consideration.

As already observed, in the very brief but comprehensive cosmogony of Moses, there is an evident *priority* of action on the part of the Divine Being, to that of entering upon the work of each successive day. Otherwise, is it not difficult to conceive the propriety, on the part of the inspired historian, of marking so minutely the process consecutively of the work of

*each day?*¹ The only consistent construction of the narrative, therefore, as I conceive, is to institute a distinction, in this stupendous work of God, between that of CREATION and of FORMATION. "In the beginning, God CREATED the heavens and the earth." But, even *after* their creation, "the earth was *without form and void*, and *darkness* was upon the face of the *deep*;" i. e., they remained in a *chaotic* state, a mass of indescribable confusion. *After* their creation, "the spirit of God *moved* upon the face of the waters," thereby preparing the *embryo* earth and heavens for the parts which they were respectively to occupy in the material universe, during both the progress and consummation of their organized forms. The first verse of Genesis therefore speaks of the creation of the SUBSTANCE, or *prima materia* of the heavens and earth. The second, to the vital energies of a SUPERNATURAL agency, in preparing the primordial elements for subsequent organization. And the third and following verses to the end of chapter first, to the arranging those elements in their proper form.

Of the first part of the second theory, which asserts an organization of the chaotic elements *previous* to the first of the six days, we observe, that it seems entirely at variance with the Cosmogony of Moses. There is, upon the face of the history, a total silence as to any organization *prior* to the FIRST DAY. The conclusion, therefore, is, that there is a distinction to be

1 Com. Gen. i, 1, 2, with v. 3, 6, 9, 14, 20, 25. ii. 1—3.

instituted between the work of creating the SUBSTANCE, or PRIMA MATERIA of the universe, and that of its *subsequent* ORGANIZATION. And also, that there could be NO organization of said substance *prior* to the FIRST of the *six days*.

We now proceed to furnish evidence, that each of the *six days* of organization as above, was a period of vast length. Of the LENGTH of the *six days* organization of the previously created elements of nature, (the subject now to be discussed,) we enquire ; — were they *six natural or solar days*, as measured by the revolutions of the earth on its axis once in twenty-four hours? Or, were they *six periods* of greater length?

Now, of the first of these two theories we remark, the point to be decided is not, what, in the creation and formation of the stupendous system of nature the Almighty *could* do, but what he actually *did* do. The supposition of what the Almighty *could* do, which, by the way, forms the *basis* of the first of the above theories, involves the intervention of a *miracle*, in giving existence to the material universe ; and if by the intervention of a miracle, then we ask, why extend it continuously through the term of *six days* ; when the Almighty *could* have accomplished the same work in a *moment* of time ? It should, however, be borne in mind, that when a miracle is wrought as a display of infinite wisdom and power, it always stands connected with circumstances calling for a diversion, from their *natural* course, of the ordinary and permanently established laws of *physical* nature.

Then too, the *object* of a miracle ; which is, to produce a *moral* effect ; to persuade, to convict, where all *ordinary* evidence has failed. Thus, the turning of a rod into a serpent, &c., by Moses ;¹ the arresting the natural course of the Sun and Moon by Joshua ;² the causing of the iron axe to swim by Elias ;³ the turning of water into wine, &c., &c., by Christ ;⁴ the healing of the cripple by St. Peter,⁵ with scores of others of a similar nature, are all so many instances of miraculous interruptions of natures laws, and they were designed, as *extraordinary* means, to cure men of their idolatry, infidelity, or atheism. But, Noah's ark was not built by miracle — he was one hundred and twenty years engaged in its erection.⁶ Nor was the earth deluged by miracle. It was nought but the effect of natural causes, under the direction and control of Almighty power. Hence, until it can be made to appear that, in the creation and formation of the material heavens and earth, the Great Architect of nature wrought a *superfluous* miracle, no rational argument can be derived from the admission of what he *could* do, in support of this first theory ; nor is it easy for us to conceive how such an admission contributes, as it is contended, to aggrandize our views of the Divine wisdom and power, or of the magnitude and magnificence of his works.

What remains for us now is, to adduce what we

1. Exod. viii., 8—10. 2. Josh. x., 12, 13.

3. 2 Kings vi., 5 7 4. John ii., 1—11.

5. Acts iii., 1—11. 6. Comp. Gen. vi., 3, with 1 Pet. iii., 20.

conceive to be evidence, in support of the latter theory, viz. : — that the six days of organization or formation of the primordial chaotic elements of nature were, not six natural or solar days, but six periods of vast length.

Here we shall notice, in the first place, the point of difference between the *third* and *fourth* theories above named. The former theory attributes to the six days an *indefinite* period, and also divides these periods unequally ; — the latter, from the nature of the evidence adduced, assigns to each period, a *vast, definite, and uniform* length. Let us however,

I. Adduce the evidence, that each day of the six, must have greatly exceeded the length of a natural or solar day ; and,

II. That they were all not only of vast but definite, and uniform length.

I. That each day of the six, must have greatly exceeded the length of a natural or solar day of twenty four hours, (relying upon the cosmogony of Moses as our guide,) we think abundantly evident,

1. *From the ordinary and obvious process of organization, as therein described.* In illustration of this subject, it is only necessary to compare the process of organization or formation of the vegetable family on the *third* day, with those of fishes, birds, beasts, reptiles, and man, on the *fifth* and *sixth* days. For, on the supposition that the three intervening days were three days of twenty-four hours each, one of two consequences follow : either first, vegetation must have been formed in a *mature* state on the third

day, or that maturity must have been effected through the medium of an *unnatural* growth, in order to answer the purposes of food to all the animal world not carnivorous; and which, in either case, would argue the intervention of a *miracle*: or, second, all animals not carnivorous, the productions of the fifth and sixth days work, must inevitably have *perished* with *hunger*. But, that they were neither thus formed on the *third* day, or brought to an unnatural maturity between the third and *sixth* days, is abundantly evident from the history itself. Moses, Genesis ii. v. 5., in his enlarged account of the work of Creation says, that the Almighty made "every PLANT of the field *before it was in the earth*, and every HERB of the field *before it grew*:" &c. i. e., the *seeds* of these vegetables were thus formed, not the plants and herbs in their mature state. This seems to be the obvious purport of the original מִצְּרָח and of the Greek ἀνατεῖλαι, which may be rendered, *BEFORE it sprouted or germinated*: which, if not strictly true of plants, yet most certainly of herbs; for, with what consistency can herbs be said to have arrived at maturity "BEFORE they grew"? And if this be true of the one, then why not of the other? The conclusion therefore is, that the *seeds* of plants and herbs, having been formed on the third day, were left to nature, in its ordinary operations, to be brought to maturity; and as we know that the process of germination is gradual, and that it requires many years for trees to attain even a moderate size, the *third, fourth, fifth*

and *sixth* days at least, must have exceeded the length of so many natural or solar days.

2. *The physiological structure of our globe demonstrates, that its origin is to be attributed to remote antiquity.* Here we have to premise in the first place, that the material heavens and earth, at their *first creation*, were not stamped with that *perfection* which the popular view appropriates to it. Nor will this be found in the least to derogate from the adequacy either of the wisdom, the power, or the goodness of the Great Creator. Viewed *as a whole*, it will be found in perfect harmony with the vast designs of God as connected with that "NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH," which is destined to receive that stamp of perfection from the hand of the Almighty Architect, which in his infinite wisdom was *withheld* from the first. Nor, speaking theologically, are we now treading upon *new-ground*. No. This view of the comparative perfection of the first and second creation, with many others of equal importance in conveying correct apprehensions of the work of God *as a whole*, has in a great measure been *lost* to the Church. *Lost*, we say. For, with the exception of the period which intervened from the Apostle's time to the Nicene Council A. D. 325, and the early part of the Reformation, this doctrine has become comparatively obsolete. But, Dr. Burnett, in his elaborate *Treatise on the "Theory of the Earth,"* quoting, on this subject, the sentiments of the Council of Nice, which was convened by Constantine the Great about the year three hundred and twenty-five, soon after the

establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire, and when the fundamental doctrines of the gospel for the most part were yet "uncorrupt," makes the following extract. — "The world was made *meaner*, or *less perfect*, providentially; for God foresaw that *man* would sin. Wherefore we expect NEW HEAVENS AND A NEW EARTH, according to the Holy Scriptures," &c.¹ The same sentiment prevailed at the Reformation, and was thus reduced to form under the reign of Edward VI., in the Church of England Catechism. Thus it speaks — "The end of the world Holy Scripture calleth the fulfilling and performance of the kingdom and mystery of Christ, and the renewing of all things; for, saith the Apostle Peter, (2 Epist. iii.) We, according to his promise, look for NEW HEAVENS AND A NEW EARTH, wherein dwelleth righteousness. And it seemeth reason that corruption, unsteadfast change, and sin, whereunto the whole world is subject, should at length have an end, according to the witness of the Apostle; '*The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up*;' as though he had said — As gold is wont to be fined, so shall the whole world be *purified with fire*, and be brought to its full perfection. *The lesser world*, which is *man*, following the same, shall likewise be *delivered* from corruption and change; and so, for *man*, this *greater world*, which for *his sake* was first

1. Burnett's Theo. of the Earth, vol. II., p. 246, *et seq.*

created, shall at length be *removed*, and be clad with *another hue*, MUCH MORE PLEASANT AND BEAUTIFUL." ¹

This, we repeat, was the generally received sentiment of the Church during the two periods of her greatest purity: the first, from the Apostle's times down to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, and the second, at the Reformation. And, whatever may be the strength of prejudice of those who discard a doctrine simply because it has grown venerable by age, we expect "better things" of those who profess to respect "ancient authors" as the *best witnesses for, and interpreters of, "Holy Scripture."* Nor indeed shall we relinquish the hope, that both the one and the other may be brought to see the utter impossibility of harmonizing the Scriptural cosmogony of the creation with the scientific discoveries of phisiology, in any other way: not that our theory tends to derogate from the Mosaic account of the creation as an *inspired* production; far from it — but that the physiological discoveries of the structure of our globe, furnish the only rational and tangible key by which to interpret it. As an *handmaid* to inspiration, it steps forward, and, by the rays of refraction, as collected from existing phenomena in the physical construction of the earth, elucidates and confirms it.

What then, we ask, are some of these phenomena? We answer, first, that whatever they are, we are to seek for them amid the wonders of the subterranean

1. Cox's Millena. Ans. p. 39, 40.

world, in the form of fossils or petrifications exumed from the various *Strata*, out of which many of the secondary mountains, &c., of our globe is formed. Now, these fossil remains, bearing upon them the evident stamp of vast antiquity, many have attempted to account for *exclusively* on the principle of those mighty changes effected in the present physical structure of our globe, through the agency of the universal deluge. But, if it can be demonstrated that there *are* existing fossil phenomena, of the origin of which the universal deluge cannot furnish a satisfactory account, it is clear that they must have existed *anterior* to the deluge; and if anterior to the deluge, as there was no such revolution in the physical world *between* the formation of man and that event, by which such fossils or petrifications could by any possibility have been formed, we must date their origin *anterior* to the *Paradisaical State*; and if anterior to the *Paradisaical State*, they could only have been formed by some mighty convulsions of nature, during the period of the six days organization or formation of the material earth and heavens. This admitted, and beyond controversy, the six days organization of the material universe, must have been six periods of vast length.

We proceed, therefore, to demonstrate, that the effects produced upon our globe by its subjection to the action (powerful and universal as it was) of the *Deluge*, are totally inadequate to account for *all* the fossilated phenomena extant. Now, no one pretends, so far as the writer is aware, that any of the *genus* of land animals which existed *prior* to the flood, became

extinct by that event.¹ But, naturalists assure us of the extinction of whole *genera*, both of land and sea animals, and also of vegetables, neither of which could have existed between the creation of man and the flood, but the memorials of whose existence are transmitted to us in their present fossilated remains.* And, that distinguished naturalist *Cuvier*, in his essay on the Theory of the Earth, admits the possibility that there are many *genera* of SEA animals yet unknown, but denies that it can apply to the larger *genera* of LAND animals,² which, as the reader will perceive, strongly corroborates the above statement. Then also, the *Strata*, in which these fossil remains are deposited, have been evidently torn and rent by some mighty convulsion of nature; and though it be admitted that this was the effect of the *deluge*, yet it is clear that the strata *themselves* must have existed *prior* thereto. Finally, allowing the hypothesis, that fossil remains, which are of such prodigious extent "as to form even whole masses of secondary mountains, were all the *effects* of the general deluge, how are we to account for the fact, that, of the millions of

1. Consult Gen. vi., 19 — 22; vii., 2, 3, 8, 9; viii., 19.

2. Mr. Faber on this subject observes — It is possible, I allow, that many *genera* of marine animals, as yet unknown to naturalists, may even now be in existence: but it is next to impossible, that any *genera* of the larger land animals should still be in existence, and should nevertheless have hitherto remained concealed from human observation. See this matter well discussed in *Cuvier's Essay on the theory of the earth*. § 25, p. 61. 4th Edit. Treat. on the three Disp. Vol. I., p. 122, 123.

3. Theory, &c. p. 61 — § 25. Ed. the 4th.

human beings "who perished at that time," the "proper fossilized" remains of not even one of them should ever yet have been found among that mighty mass? ¹

1. It is quite undeniable, says Mr. Cuvier, that no human remains have been hitherto discovered among the extraneous fossils: and this furnishes a strong proof, that the extinct races, which are now found in a fossil state, were not varieties of known *species*, since they never could have been subjected to human influence.

When I assert, that human bones have not been hitherto found among extraneous fossils, I must be understood to speak of fossils or petrifications properly so called: as, in peat depositions or turf bogs and in alluvial formations as well as in ancient burying grounds, the bones of men, with those of horses and other ordinary existing *species* of animals, may readily enough be found; but among the fossil paleotheria and elephants and rhinoceroses, the smallest fragment of human bone has never been detected. Most of the laborers in the gypsum quarries about Paris are firmly persuaded, that the bones they contain are in a great part human: but, after having seen and carefully examined many thousands of those bones, I may safely affirm, that not a single fragment of them has ever belonged to our species. I carefully examined at Pavia the collection of extraneous fossil bones brought there by Spallanzani from the island of Cerigo: and, notwithstanding the assertion of that celebrated observer, I affirm that there is not a single fragment among them that ever formed part of a human skeleton. Every where else, the fragments of bone, considered as human, have been found to belong to some animal, either when the fragments themselves have been actually examined, or even when their engraved figures have been inspected. Such real human bones, as have been found in a fossil state, belonged to bodies, which had fallen into crevices of rocks or had been left in the forsaken galleries of ancient mines and were covered up by incrustation: and I extend this assertion to the human skeletons, discovered in Guadaloupe, in a rock formed of pieces of madrepora thrown up by the sea and united by water impregnated with calcareous matter.

Every circumstance, therefore, contributes to establish this posi-

These considerations we deem of such importance to our general argument as not to allow that they should be viewed simply in the light of *collateral* evidence of the fact, as to the great antiquity of our globe. Cuvier on this subject observes, that it is only to the investigation of the relations of extraneous fossils with the strata in which they are contained, that we owe the commencement even of a Theory of the earth: as, but for them, we could never have even suspected that there had existed any successive epochs in the formation of our Earth, and a series of different and consecutive operations in reducing it to its present state. *By them alone* we are enabled to ascertain, *with the utmost certainty*, that our earth has not always been covered over by the *same* external crust: because we are thoroughly assured, that the organized bodies, to which these fossil remains belong, must have *lived* upon the surface, *before* they came to be buried, as they now are, at a great depth.

Now, having, in accordance with this statement, demonstrated, the existence of fossil remains of extinct

tion: that the human race did not exist in the countries, in which the fossil bones of animals have been discovered, at the epoch when these bones were covered up; as there cannot be a single reason assigned, why men should have entirely escaped from such general catastrophes, or, if they also had been destroyed and covered over at the same time, why their remains should not be now found along with those of the other animals. Essay on the theory of the earth. § 30., p. 128 — 133.

A fossil human skeleton from Guadaloupe, but pronounced to be a recent formation, is now in the British Museum.

1. Theory of the Earth. § 23., pp. 54, 55.

marine and land animals and vegetables, it remains that we adduce evidence, as already observed, of the impossibility of harmonizing the scriptural cosmogony of the creation with these scientific discoveries of physiology in any other way, than by a comparison of the statements of the one, with the existing phenomena as developed in the *order* of stratification of the other. And, in order to this, and for the sake of greater perspicuity and accuracy, we will present a *brief* of the order of formation of each of the six days or epochs consecutively, as laid down in the Mosaic Cosmogony. The primitive rocks are represented as being first separated from the chaotic waters; plants and herbs are formed next; then fishes; then birds; next, land-animals and reptiles; and finally, man. Now, upon the supposition, that the six days of formation as given by Moses, were each periods of vast length, i. e., of length sufficient to produce the fossil remains of marine and land-animals and vegetables as above represented, then these fossilated remains must be found to exist in the same order of stratification continuously, with that in which they are said to have been at first organized. In other words, they must "follow each other upward in the precise order of the Mosaic Narrative." Accordingly, thus we find it. The structure of our globe in the order of stratification, presents to view first, the primitive rock or granite, entirely free from all fossil remains: next follow fossil plants and vegetables: next, fossil fishes: next, fossil birds: next, fossil land-animals and reptiles. Human fossils, none. From this order, except

indeed that occasional intermixtures may occur, there is no variation.

We shall now proceed to classify the Mosaic cosmogony of the creation, and the order of formation of the six days, with Cuvier's classification of the series of strata, with their extraneous fossils, reckoning *upwards* from the primitive rocks; after which, we shall assign the reasons, on physiological data, for the occasional deviations from this order, discoverable in the intermixtures of strata, as given in the table of that writer. And, for the purpose of perspicuity, we shall arrange the two accounts in opposite columns, thus,

| <i>Mosaic Cosmogony.</i> | <i>Cuvier.</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I. <i>First day.</i> Separation of light and darkness. | |
| II. <i>Second day.</i> Separation of air and water. | |
| III. <i>Third day.</i> Separation of land and water. | |
| First appearance of <i>primary</i> rock, in the early part of this period. No fossil remains. | <i>Primitive Rocks.</i> No fossil organic remains. |
| Middle part of this period, <i>vegetables.</i> Trees, plants, herbs. | <i>Transition Rocks.</i> First appearance of fossil <i>shells</i> and <i>corals</i> . First sandstone or old red sandstone and old red conglomerate. Fossil <i>wood</i> . First limestone or mountain limestone. Fossil <i>corals</i> and shells. <i>Coal</i> formation. Impressions of <i>plants</i> , many with a tropical aspect. New red conglomerate. |
| IV. <i>Fourth day.</i> Sun, moon, and stars. | |
| V. <i>Fifth day.</i> Fishes and Birds. | Second limestone, or magnesian limestone. First appearance of fossil <i>fishes</i> , and of fossil <i>oviparous quadrupeds</i> . Second sandstone, or new red sandstone. Fossil <i>shells</i> , <i>corals</i> , and <i>vegetables</i> . Third limestone or Jura oolite and lias lime- |

VI. *Sixth day. Beasts, Rep-
tiles, and MAN.*

stones. Fossil *shells, coral, lacertæ, fishes, and vegetables*. Third sandstone, or green sand. Fourth limestone and chalk. Fossil *shells, coals, lacertæ, turtles, and fishes*. Brown coal formation. Hertfordshire pudding-stone.

Paris formation. First appearance of fossil remains of *birds and mammiferous animals*. Remains of extinct species of *Elephant, Rhinoceros, Hippopotamus, Tapir, Deer, Hyena, Bear*. Fossil remains of the *human species*. * First appearance in this formation.

VII. *Seventh day. SABBATH OF
REST.*

In speaking of the general conformation of our earth, Mr. Cuvier observes, that the lowest and most level parts of the earth, when penetrated to a very great depth, exhibit nothing but horizontal strata, composed of various substances, and containing, almost all of them, innumerable marine productions. Similar strata, with the same kind of productions, compose the hills even to a great height. Sometimes the shells are so numerous as to constitute the entire body of the stratum. They are almost every where in such a perfect state of preservation, that even the smallest of them retain their most delicate parts, their sharpest ridges, and their finest and tenderest processes. Every part of the earth, each hemisphere, every continent, every island of any size, exhibits the same phenomena. We are therefore forcibly led to believe, not only that the sea has at one period or another covered all our plains, but that it must have remained there for a long

* See note, p. 67, 68.

time and in a state of tranquility, *which circumstance was necessary for the formation of deposits so extensive, so thick, in part so solid, and containing exuviae so perfectly preserved.*¹

Now, select, by way of illustration of the above, the work of the *third day*, which was that of bringing together the granitic and earthy particles of the primitive aquatic elements, the former constituting thenceforward the primitive rock or skeleton of our globe, the latter, the soil with which it was covered. Then clothe this soil with vegetation—trees, herbs, and grass. You have now only to suppose this third day to be a period of *vast length*, and, as Mr. Faber remarks, the whole face of the earth, already separated from the waters, would soon become overspread with a rank and luxuriant vegetation: one generation of trees and plants would succeed another: a large accumulation of mould would be produced through their decomposition: and, either by one of those sudden and mighty revolutions which appear to have repeatedly agitated this globe previous to the formation of God's last work *man*, or even (we may venture to say) in the ordinary course of nature itself, vast masses of fallen timber would be plunged beneath the surface of extensive bogs and morasses; there, through the process either of stony accretion or of bituminous fermentation to be gradually transmuted, partly into fossil wood and partly into fossil coal.²

1. Theory, § 4, pp. 7, 8.

2. Treatise on three Dispen. vol., I. pp., 131, 132.

The same argument may be also applied to the *fifth* and *sixth* days; similar mundane revolutions producing similar effects. Then, too, the *order* of fossil strata must be expected to correspond with the order of these successive revolutions: i. e., fossil fishes and other marine exuviae, together with fossil birds, must be deposited *above* fossil wood and fossil coal, as the products of the *fifth* day; and those of fossil animals and fossil reptiles, *above* those of fossil birds, &c., as the products of the *sixth* day, which agrees precisely with the classification of Cuvier, as given on a preceding page.

As to the *intermixtures* of fossil stratification as given in Cuvier's table, placing fossil *shells* and *corals* IMMEDIATELY next to that of the primitive rock, they cannot be accounted for on the *diluvian* theory¹ of that writer, which assumes "*that the flood* (Noah's flood) *was produced by a complete interchange of land and water.* For, first, the four Asiatic *antediluvian* rivers are [to this day] geographically marked out and determined and identified by *post-diluvian* characteristics."² And second, existing phenomena of the bones of land animals, found under circumstances *which prove them to have inhabited the precise regions* * where these their relics have been discov-

* These phenomena, says Mr. Faber, seem to me quite decisive as to the fact, that we now inhabit the very same tracts of land that our ante-diluvian forefathers did, and consequently that we are not now living upon the bed of the ante-diluvian ocean.

In various parts of the world, caves have been discovered con-

1. Essay on Theory of the Earth. § 34. p., 173, 171.

2. Treatise on three Dis. vol I., p. 136.

ered." Still, it is beyond contradiction that we are *now* inhabiting the bed of a PRIMEVAL ocean. Where then, we ask, are we to look for the mighty convulsions of nature productive of such interchanges of land and sea,

taining numerous bones of land-animals, which certainly could not have been there deposited by the action of water. Hence the obvious inference is, an inference in truth drawn by Cuvier himself, that *the animals, to which those bones belonged, must have lived and died peaceably on the spot where we now find them*: and the propriety of this inference is further established by the nature of the earthy matter in which the bones are enveloped; for, according to Laugier, it contains an intermixture of animal matter with phosphate of lime and probably also phosphate of iron. But, if this inference be well founded, then it is plainly impossible, that our present tracts of land can have constituted the bed of the ante-diluvian ocean: because, in that case, the animals could not, before the deluge, have *inhabited* the regions where their bones are now found; such regions, according to the theory of Cuvier, having constituted the bed of the ocean as it existed immediately before the deluge.

As the subject is of no small importance, the inference in question clearly confirming the Mosaical history which describes the present race of men as inhabiting the self-same tracts of land which were inhabited by their ante-diluvian forefathers, it may not be uninteresting to adduce some of the facts on which the inference is founded.

1. Remains of the skeletons of animals are found in great abundance in limestone caves in Germany and Hungary. The bones occur nearly in the same state in all these caves; detached, broken, but never rolled: and, consequently, they have not been brought from a distance by the agency of water. They are somewhat lighter and less compact than recent bones, but slightly decomposed, contain much gelatine, and are never mineralized. They are generally enveloped in an indurated earth, which contains animal matter; sometimes in a kind of alabaster or calcareous sinter:

by which these interchanges and derangements of the regular order of fossil stratification have been produced? Certainly, for the reasons above stated, not between the *Creation of Man* and the *General Deluge!* which, it is

and, by means of this mineral, they are sometimes attached to the walls of the caves. These bones are the same in all the caves hitherto examined: and it is worthy of remark, that they occur in an extent of upwards of 200 leagues. Cuvier estimates, that rather more than three fourths of these bones belong to *species* of bears now extinct; while one half or two thirds of the remaining fourth belong to a *species* of hyena. A very small number of these remains belong to a *species* of the *genus* lion or tiger: and another, to animals of the dog or wolf kinds. Lastly, the smallest portion belongs to different *species* of smaller carnivorous animals, as the fox and polecat. It is quite evident, that these bones could not have been introduced into these caves by the action of water, because the smallest processes or inequalities on their surface are preserved. Cuvier is therefore inclined to conjecture, that *the animals, to which they belonged, must have lived and died peaceably on the spot where we now find them.*

2. The relics of several *species* of Mastodans have been found in various parts of America. The beds, which contain them, are generally alluvial, either sandy or marly, and always near the earth's surface. In many places, they are accompanied with accumulations of marine animal remains: and, in other places, the sand and marl which cover them contain only fresh-water shells. The catastrophe, which has buried them, appears to have been a transient marine inundation. The bones are neither rolled nor in skeletons; but dispersed, and in part broken or fractured. They have not therefore been brought there from a distance by an inundation: but have been found by it in the places where it has covered them; as might be expected, if the animals to which they belonged had dwelt in these places, and had there successively died. Hence it appears, that, before this catastrophe, *these animals lived in the countries where we now find their bones.*

admitted, would prove totally subversive both of existing phenomena and the verity of the Mosaic cosmogony!

Now, we shall undertake to demonstrate from Cuvier himself, the utter fallacy of his *diluvian* theory, and,

3. Exactly the same inference is drawn by Mr. Buckland from the teeth and bones of various animals discovered in a cave at Kirkdale, near Kirby-Moorside, in Yorkshire. The den of Kirkdale is a natural fissure or cavern in the oolite limestone, extending 300 feet into the solid rock, and varying from two to five feet in height and breadth. The bottom of the cavern is nearly horizontal; and is entirely covered to the depth of about a foot with a sediment of mud, deposited by diluvian waters. At the bottom of the mud, the floor of the cave was covered from one end to the other with teeth and fragments of bones of the following animals: hyena, elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, horse, ox, two or three species of deer, bear, fox, water-rat, and birds. The bones are for the most part broken and gnawed to pieces: and the teeth lie loose among the fragments of the bones. The hyena bones are broken to pieces as much as those of the other animals. No bone or tooth has been rolled or the least acted on by water, nor is there any gravel mixed with them. The bones are not at all mineralized, and retain nearly the whole of their animal gelatine; owing their high state of preservation to the mud in which they have been imbedded. The teeth of the hyena's are most abundant: and, of these, the greater part are worn down almost to the stumps, as if by the operation of gnawing bones. Portions of the dung of the hyena are found also in this den, which on analysis, afforded the same constituent parts as that of canine animals. *It is certain, that all these animals lived and died in the district where their remains are now found, in the period immediately preceding the deluge.* The bones were carried into the cave, as food, by the hyenas; the smaller animals perhaps entire, the larger ones piecemeal: for by no other means could the bones of such large animals as the elephant, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus, have arrived at the inmost recesses of so small a fissure, unless rolled thither by water; under which circumstance the angles would have been worn off by attrition, which is

as a consequence, its insufficiency to account for the above named phenomena. In his essay Mr. Cuvier says that, if there is any circumstance thoroughly established in geology, it is, that the crust of our globe has been subjected to a great and sudden revolution, *the epoch of which cannot be dated much further back than five or six thousand years* ; that this revolution had buried all the countries which were *before* inhabited by *men* and other animals that are now best known ; that the *same* revolution had laid dry the bed of the *last* ocean, which now forms all the countries at present inhabited. ¹ Again. Speaking of a succession of revolutions as having visited our globe, Mr. Cuvier makes the following remarks ; but, what is still more astonishing and not less certain, *there have not always been living creatures on the earth* ; and it is easy for the observer to discover the period at which *animal productions began to be deposited*. ² Finally, Mr. Cuvier in treating of the subject of *existing* fossil remains of *extinct* animals, &c., says, it is quite undeniable, that no *human* remains have been hitherto discovered among the *extraneous fossils* ; and this says he, furnishes a strong proof, that the *extinct* races, which are now found in

not the case. See Jameson's Notes subjoined to Cuvier's Essay. p. 364 — 369, 385 — 387.

So far as I can judge of evidence, the above is decisive as to the question whether we are now inhabiting the bed of the ocean as it existed immediately before the deluge. Treat. on three Disp. vol. I., p. 136 — 140.

1. Theory of the earth. § 34, p. 173.

2. Ibid. § 6, p. 17.

a fossil state, were not varieties of *known species* since they *never could have been subject to human influence*. And farther on he says, every circumstance, therefore, contributes to establish this position : that the *human race did not exist in the countries*, in which the fossil bones of animals have been discovered, at the *epoch* when these bones were covered up ; as there cannot be a single reason assigned why *men* should have entirely escaped such general catastrophies ; or, if they also had been destroyed or covered over at the *same* time, why their remains should not be now found along with those of the other animals. ¹

Now, in regard to the first of the above quotations, that Mr. Cuvier is speaking of the effects of the *Universal Deluge*, there can be no doubt : for the quotation not only contains within *itself*, a summary of his diluvian theory, but it stands in immediate connexion with what he says of the escaping from the effects of that great revolution, of the small number of individuals of *men* and *other* animals, that have *since* propagated and spread over the lands *then* newly laid dry.² To this, as further evidence, we may also add, that, *since* that catastrophe, no other revolution by any possibility can be named, i. e., *within* the dates which he assigns to it, at all adequate to produce, as he pretends, an entire interchange of land and water. Then again, says Mr. Cuvier.—*Before* this catastrophe, *men* and *other* animals inhabited those *very* countries, submerged by the above superabounding waters ; which most certainly

1. Essay on Theory of the Earth, § 30, p. 128—133.

2. Ibid. § 34. p., 174.

must have resulted in the destruction of *men* as well as other animals. And yet Mr. Cuvier says in the third quotation, that no *human* remains have been hitherto discovered among the extraneous fossils: which circumstance, he says, contributes to establish this position: that the *human* race did not exist in the countries in which the fossil bones of animals have been discovered, *at the epoch* when these bones were covered up.

Unless we greatly misjudge, the reader would consider it no enviable task, to attempt a reconciliation of such palpably conflicting statements. A great physical revolution, producing an entire interchange of land and water — the land being previously inhabited by *men and other animals*, all of whom, except a very small number, being *lost* in the catastrophe — and yet, in after ages, when the fossil remains of these animals are discovered, *human beings* are denied to have *previously* existed, because no fossil *human* form is found among *other* discovered fossil animals!

But, herein we are furnished with a most striking evidence of the lamentable defectibility of *human reason*, in the application of the sciences to existing phenomena, when relied upon as a guide in our search of truth, to the *exclusion* of REVELATION. The truth is, while, in the developements of the science of physiology, strong *collateral* evidence is furnished of the *verity* of the Mosaic cosmogony, there are bounds set to human reason in its application thereto, beyond which it cannot pass. See this fact illustrated in Mr. Cuvier's statements regarding the *date* of the commencement

of his diluvian period, at which time the process of fossil formation must have begun. Speaking of this latter process he says, it is easy for the observer to *discover the period* at which animal productions *began* to be deposited.¹ And yet, the nearest point of approximation to it is, not much farther back than five or six thousand years. But, this calculation, at five thousand years, would place his diluvian epoch at about A. M. 950; at six thousand, it would make it *anterior* to the Mosaic cosmogony of the creation of man! It remains, therefore, for the candid reader to decide, whether he will reject the authenticity of the sacred narrative on account of this single apparent discrepancy of the science of physiology therewith, when *every other part* of the discoveries of that acute philosopher, as well as others, undesignedly, no doubt, on his and their part, conspire to *confirm* it. The reader therefore cannot but perceive the force of the following logical conclusion, from the pen of the learned Faber. Speaking of this diluvian theory of Cuvier, he says, that it is so wholly irreconcilable with the Mosaical history both of the ante-diluvian world and of the deluge itself and of the post-diluvian world, in which the four Asiatic *ante-diluvian* rivers are geographically marked out and determined and identified by *post-diluvian* characteristics, that it cannot for a moment be admitted by any consistent believer in the scriptural verity. Nor is it more reconcilable with the actually existing phenomena of the

1. Essay on Theory of the Earth, § 6. p. 17.

bones of land animals, found under circumstances which prove them to have *inhabited* the *precise* regions where these their relics have been discovered: for, had the regions in question been the bed of the ante-diluvian ocean, it is clear that no *land animals* could have *inhabited* them.¹

All difficulties accompanying our researches into available facts, however, vanish, when the developments of physiological science, as far as known, and the Mosaic narrative of the Creation, &c., are viewed *together*. Oryctological discoveries demonstrate, that the various succession of strata in which fossil formations are deposited, as they ascend upward from the primitive rock, in which no fossil remains whatever are to be found, have undergone the process of *severe ruptures*; which circumstance proves that they existed *prior* to whatever cause produced them. And admitting, as we do, that these ruptures might have been produced by the catastrophe which attended our globe at the time of the universal deluge, they were quite sufficient to effect those very *intermixtures* of fossil formations, deposited in their respective previously existing strata, as given in the classification of Cuvier. Here again, we quote Mr. Faber. Rents and ruptures, and disarrangements, he says, may be continually observed in the several strata of fossil bodies; which disturb their *regularity*, and which have evidently been produced by some mighty convulsion. And, he continues, whether that convulsion

1. Three Dispen. I., p. 136.

was produced by the deluge, or whether it preceded the deluge, (for in either case the result of the argument will be the same,) the fossil remains, which constitute these strata, must have existed *anterior* to the deluge, and consequently cannot be the *effects* of the deluge.¹

In regard to those mighty convulsions of nature through which our globe has passed, resulting in successive, and, for ought we know to the contrary, frequent *interchanges* of land and water, Mr. Faber says, the perpetual discovery of fossil fishes and of other exuviæ in the very centre of the largest continents, deposited *above* the strata of fossil wood and vegetables, sufficiently demonstrates, with respect to one of these revolutions, not merely that the waters of the Ocean must have *passed over* those continents, but that the continents themselves must at some remote period have been the *permanent* bed of the Ocean: for, as physiologists are well aware, a *temporary* inundation is wholly insufficient to account for the phenomena which present themselves. This appeal of Mr. Faber to physiologists is thus responded to by Mr. Cuvier. We are, says he, forcibly led to believe, not only that the sea has at one period or another covered all our plains, but that it must have remained there for a *long time* and in a state of *tranquility*; which circumstance was *necessary* for the formation of deposits, so extensive, so thick, in part

1. Three Dispen. I., p. 123.

so solid, and containing exuviæ so perfectly preserved.¹

Under these circumstances, therefore, says Mr. Faber, the result is obvious. We now inhabit the bed, indeed, of a *primeval* ocean, but, not of the *antediluvian* ocean: because, according both to actually *existing phenomena* and to the *inspired history* in its plain and obvious construction, we *now* inhabit the very same tracts of land, (allowing for those smaller alterations, which a convulsion like the flood would of course produce,) that our ante-diluvian predecessors formerly inhabited. Therefore the primeval ocean, whose bed we now inhabit, must have been an ocean, which, as *thus* situated, was in existence *prior* to the creation of man.

On such necessary grounds, I conclude, says Mr. Faber, that the sea and the land must, to a certain extent, have changed places (and that too for a sufficient length of time to produce existing phenomena) in the course at least of the *fifth* day of the creation, to say nothing more of *those yet more ancient* revolutions which have apparently occurred during the lapse of the *third* and the *fourth* days.²

1. Essay on Theory, &c., § 4, p. 8.

2. Three Dispen. I., pp. 134, 139, 140, 141.

SECTION IV.

But it is still urged, that we have as yet *omitted* to give, in round numbers, the whole period of the *Sabbatic Rest* of the Almighty, as the period which, *analogically*, was to determine the length of each of the six demiurgic days. Of this fact we are fully aware. Nor is it compatible with our present purpose to say more than to state the simple fact, that the seventh day, as the sabbatic repose of the Almighty, embraces the round number of SIX THOUSAND years. Dating the course of fulfilment of the predicted events of Daniel from the commencement of the seventy prophetic weeks,¹ and adding the aggregate amount of time to that which preceded that date, and it gives you the number of six thousand years. Now, if, *within* this period, *all* the events which God before declared should take place, actually transpires, what follows? What, but the expiration, the breaking up of His administration as the *Preserver* and *Governor* of this world, physical and moral, and the introduction of a new order of things? Yes, and it was this very truth that the apostle Peter, when preaching to the Jewish murderers of our Lord, set forth in the following pathetic strain: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord: and he shall *send* JESUS CHRIST, which *before* was preached unto you: WHOM THE HEAVENS MUST RECEIVE, UNTIL THE TIMES OF RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS,

1. Chap. ix., 24 — 27.

WHICH GOD HATH SPOKEN BY THE MOUTH OF ALL HIS HOLY PROPHETS, SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN." ¹

While, therefore, it is reserved for a subsequent part of this Treatise to furnish the Scriptural evidence at large, showing that the Almighty *has* affixed to his "determined times" a limited and definite period, we shall now presume upon its admission, and proceed at once to lay down the two following inferences. *First*, if the *seventh day*, as the sabbath of rest to the Almighty, exceeded the length of a natural or solar day; then, by analogy of language, *each* of the *six preceding days* must have exceeded the length of a natural or solar day. And *second*, that if the seventh day of the Almighty's repose embraced the period of *six thousand* years, then, by analogy of reasoning, *each* of the *six preceding days* must have embraced a period of *six thousand* years. The result, therefore, of the principles of exposition adopted in this Treatise is, that besides the vast and indefinite period which we assign to the divine agency over the *chaotic* elements of creation, the whole period of organization or formation during the six days, amounts to the definite period of THIRTY-SIX THOUSAND YEARS !

From this conclusion, however, the learned Faber, in his treatise on the Three Dispensations, dissents. Having, in his usual style of reasoning, (which, by the way, is generally marked with a force, a cogency of logical demonstration common to but few modern wri-

1. Acts iii. 19 — 21.

ters,) asserted the principle here laid down, not only that there should be a distinction made between the work of creation and that of organization or formation, but that the six days assigned by the cosmogony of Moses thereto, should be extended to six demiurgic periods, he still treats those periods as of varying and consequently *indefinite* length. It is difficult, however, for us to conceive why one day, the first, for instance, should be supposed to embrace a period of three thousand years; the third, of five thousand; the fifth, of seven thousand, and the intermediate days of proportionate variation; and especially if, by analogy of language as he asserts, these days are to be understood "*homogeneously*;"¹ adopting, as he does, the *seventh day* as the criterion of measurement to the rest. Now, of this seventh day he says, that it is in truth a period commensurate with the duration of the created universe.² And again, that it is a period of not less duration than *six millenaries*,³ i.e. of six thousand years. Here then, so far as *his* authority goes, we are safe in our estimate of the seventh day at six thousand years; for it is not of *less* duration than six millenaries. Wherefore, then, this *doubt* as to the distinct limits set to the duration of the created universe? Why, what that duration will be, says he, no one knows save the Father only;⁴ in proof of which he quotes St. Matthew, chapter xxiv., verse 36. But this passage, as we shall prove in its proper place, does not

1. Faber's Trea. vol. I., p. 112.

2. Treatise, &c. vol. I., p. 116. 3. Ibid, p. 117. 4. Ibid, p. 116.

relate to the limits set to the *created universe*: — it speaks of the period of the **SECOND ADVENT** of Christ; which, as the Scriptures teach us, is to *precede* the destruction of the present earth and heavens, the time of which, between the present and its actual consummation, as to the day and hour, (not the *year*,) is known only to the Father. And we now assert, and challenge proof to the contrary, that the period of the second appearing of Christ, in its *day* and *hour* aspect, is the **ONLY** period, in *unfulfilled* prophetic chronology, concerning which, it can consistently be said that there is any uncertainty. The difference between the chronology of the Hebrew and Samaritan versions of the Scriptures, of which Mr. Faber speaks, ¹ will hereafter receive due attention, and the reasons assigned why precedence should be given to the former.

In conclusion I would observe, that the misapprehension of the import of a single passage of Scripture, as that of Matthew xxiv. 36, has, to my mind, involved this part of the above learned treatise in a style of composition, the tendency of which is to *defeat*, in a measure, its own object, by undermining whatever of previous convictions may have been produced. The writer says — “With respect to the analogy of language, we are told, that the Lord fashioned the world in *six days*, and that he rested on the *seventh* ;” which analogy of language, he says, requires us to understand these days *homogeneously*. And then he puts the question, as to “what *specific* (or, as I suppose

1. Treatise, &c. vol. 1., p. 117.

definite) period it (i. e. the term *day*) describes in the Mosaic history of the creation?" to which he adds—"for, just as we understand *one* of these days, so must we understand them *all*;"¹ i. e. if one day (the seventh) is a natural or solar day, so are all — or if one day (the seventh) is not less than six millenaries, so are all.

Now, from premises thus assumed, one would naturally enough be led to look for *specific* results. Yet under the argument for the extension of the six demi-urgic days, as founded in the discoveries of physiologists, he speaks of these "six creative days" as being "six periods of vast, though to us *unknown* duration;"² and farther on he makes "*each* a period of *more* than six millenaries."³ But this he thinks is all satisfactorily accounted for in the indefinite import of the original Hebrew word day, which that word in English so imperfectly expresses.⁴ But we ask whether, because a word in scriptural phraseology is considered *equivocal*, i. e. that in one place it may mean one thing, and elsewhere it may mean another, that therefore its true and definite sense cannot be ascertained? No biblical scholar will admit this for a moment. The *subject* with which it stands *connected* is the *key* to unlock its import. Indeed, it was this very mode of interpretation which Mr. Faber adopted in the commencement of his investigations of this subject. Sometimes, says he, it (the term *day*) denotes *a single revolution of the earth round its axis*: sometimes it denotes *a revolu-*

1. Treatise I. pp. 112, 113. 2. Ibid, pp. 120, 121. 3. Ibid, p. 126.

4. Ibid, vol. I., pp. 119, 120.

tion of the earth round the sun, or what we call a *natural year*:¹ sometimes it denotes a *whole millenary*:² sometimes it denotes a *period of probably great, but of wholly indeterminate length*;³ &c. Now, let the reader turn to the passages referred to, and see if, in each instance, there is not a specific, definite sense given to it.

Here therefore, we shall retrace our steps, in order to a recapitulation of the argument, that each of the six days organization or formation of the previously created chaotic elements mentioned in the cosmogony of Moses, must have greatly exceeded the length of a natural or solar day.

Our first argument was founded on the ordinary and obvious process of organization as therein described, which we illustrated by a comparison of the work of the *third* day, the period of organization of the *vegetable* family, with those of the *fifth* and *sixth* days, which were appropriated to the formation of *fishes, birds, animals, reptiles*, and finally, *MAN*. For, as the products of vegetation on the *third* day, were the only means of *sustenance* to all animals not carnivorous, &c., they must either have been formed by miracle in a *mature* state, (which we have demonstrated could not be,) or else *time* must have been allowed them for their natural growth.

1. Num. xiv., 34; Ezek. iv., 6; Dan. xii., 11, 12; Rev. xi., 3, 9; xii., 6.

2. Ps. xc., 4; 2 Pet. iii., 8.

3. Isa. ii., 12; xiii., 6; Joel i., 15; Zeph. i., 7, 8, 18; Mal. iv., 5; 1 Thess. v., 2; 2 Per. iii., 10.

But we adopted the latter conclusion, on the ground that, as the sacred historian informs us, "God made every HERB of the field, BEFORE it grew,"¹ i. e., before it *sprouted* or germinated; and if herbs, then by parity of reason, PLANTS also: on which principle, without the intervention of a superfluous miracle, all animals dependant on them for food, would have an abundant supply as soon as required, they not having been formed till the fifth and sixth days; while, on the contrary supposition, except by miracle, they must all have perished from hunger.

Our next argument for the extension of the six days to six periods, was founded on the physiological structure of our globe. Under this argument we premised, first, that the popular opinion that the first creation was stamped with absolute perfection, was contrary not only to the opinion of the Church in her best and purest ages, but also to fact — for,

1. Existing fossil remains, found amid the wonders of the subterranean world, as they cannot be accounted for on the principle of the universal deluge, none of the *genus* of land-animals which entered by pairs into the Ark which Noah having, by that catastrophe, become extinct, it follows that they must have existed *prior* to that event; and if so, then prior to the creation of MAN; evidence of which is furnished from the fact, first, that the *Strata* in which these fossils are deposited, have been *deranged*, which proves them to have existed *prior* to the deluge,

1. Gen. ii., 4, 5.

even if produced by it: and second, that among the fossil extant remains, though millions of *human* beings perished by the flood, no relic of the fossil *human* form is to be found.

We then argued, that these animals must have lived upon the *surface* of the earth, BEFORE they came to be buried, as they now are, at so great a depth. And hence; that a knowledge of the science of physiology was indispensable to a knowledge of the *structure* of our earth, and of the successive *epochs* of its formation.

Here, however, arose a difficulty, viz.:—that of *harmonizing* the Scriptural Cosmogony of Moses with the extant fossil discoveries of the science of physiology, as it relates to the order or arrangement of the respective fossil strata from the primitive rock upward; for, the *statements* of the one, *must* correspond with the development of *facts* of the other, or, the scriptural *verity* must be called in question.

This matter, however, has been fully brought to view, by a *comparison* of the order of the six days *formation* of the material heavens and earth as given by Moses, with the order of fossil strata as set down in Cuvier's physiological table, between which, as we have shown, there is an exact correspondence, with the exception, that what Cuvier cannot account for in the *intermixtures* of fossil strata upon the principle of his *diluvian* theory, is fully explained by the cosmogony of Moses; which cosmogony, taken in connexion with the developments of the above science, *shows most conclusively, that there must of necessity*

have been several successive interchanges of land and water BEFORE the creation of man, producing these stupendous results, of which the universal deluge was wholly inadequate.

The conclusions therefore are as follows,

1st. That each day of the six, as mentioned by Moses, must have greatly exceeded the length of a natural or solar day, or a day of twenty-four hours. And,

2nd. That, if our animadversions on Mr. Faber's theory regarding the length of each of the six days formation of the several parts of the universe be correct, as founded, homogeneously, on the length of the seventh day, (the length of that day, as we shall show in the sequel, being definitely determined,) then each of these six days are of definite and uniform length.

SECTION V.

There is, however, an objection still urged that Moses cannot be the author of the books ascribed to him, which objection we should at this time examine in all its bearings, in its direct relation to the Pentateuch, but for the fact that it is directed with equal force against the entire body of Scripture, by such as consider them the invention of a subtle priesthood. A single refutation of the cavil, therefore, as applicable to "all Scripture," will be deemed the most effectual method of vindication of its several parts.

The maxim of justice is, that *fraud* is in no case to be *presumed*, but *proved*. This charge, however, is preferred by the objector not only, but the burden of

evidence which it is his business to adduce in its support, is thrown upon the advocates of Christianity, with a challenge to demonstrate the authenticity of the several parts of Holy Writ, as bearing the names of their respective authors, as also the time when they respectively flourished. To this course, however unreasonable, they submit. This premised, we observe, that the sin of this portentous charge, the charge of *fraudulency* in the production of the Bible, is peculiar to the reckless hardihood of the last preceding century.

We shall now venture upon a proof of the authenticity of the several books of the Old Testament and of the New, "by the very same evidences that *infidelity itself* admits as *conclusive* in every similar inquiry; and we begin by asking the objector whether he has any ancient books, the authors of which are handed down to our time, without any serious dispute or cavil? and to this inquiry we must be answered yes, several — the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, the poems of Homer, the works of Xenophon, Lucien, Plutarch, Epictetus, and others of the Greeks; Cicero, Cæsar, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, Sallust, Pliny, and others of the Latins; some of them *long before*, some at the *same period*, and some a very little *after* the books of the dates of the New Testament. We now ask how the objector *knows* that these classic works were written by the authors whose names they bear? The answer is, because they have been handed down to us without any contradiction or dispute, as the works of these men; because they are recognised and appealed to by all the other writers who have

lived *since* their day, and by each other; because a conspiracy so extensive, in favor of a literary fraud, is highly improbable, not to say impossible in its nature; and because, had it been possible, there was no motive of interest to induce any one to attempt it.

Now, this is precisely *our* argument in favor of Moses, as the author of the Pentateuch, and consequently of the Creation of the World, the Origin of Mankind, &c.; and so of ALL the other writers of the inspired volume.

Thus, then, at this stage of our advance, have we demonstrated, 1st, that the universe, a little speck of which we inhabit, &c., *is not eternal*. 2nd, that the antiquity of the sacred records is *antecedent to all others*, whether Hindoo, Egyptian, Chinese, Persian, or Etruscan. 3rd, that the six days of creation and of formation of the material earth and heavens mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis, are not six natural or solar days, but *periods* of vast and stupendous length; and 4th, that Moses and the other writers of the Old and New Testament *are the authors* of the histories whose names they bear.

Our conclusion, therefore, is, that the BIBLE is not only the *best*, but that it is the *only* source whence we are to derive information respecting THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WORLD; or, in other words, to determine in round numbers, *the point of time upon which we now stand*, in the successive evolutions of God's dispensations to man.

Thus much have we deemed serviceable, if not, indeed, *essential*, to a right understanding and apprecia-

tion of the subject before us ; which, we again repeat, is to determine the age of the world, as educed from the chronological records of Scripture, historic and prophetic, from the creation and fall of man to the final restitution of all things ; to a consideration of which we invite the serious attention of the reader, as set forth in the two following lectures.

LECTURE I.

AGE OF THE WORLD, &c.

MATT. XXIV. 3.

“And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?”

The subject of this Lecture, and the passage as just read, and upon which the lecture is founded, is, The Age of the World, as educed from the chronological records of Scripture, Historic and Prophetic, from the creation of man to the final “restitution of all things.”

As preliminary to the elucidation of this subject, we considered it as indispensable, that we *meet*, and use our endeavors to *remove*, those principles antagonistic to the sentiment which it involves. The antagonistic principles named by us were, those of the *Atheist*, who asserts an ETERNITY as well to the *origin* as to the *existence* of the world: of the *Antiquarian*, who claims a vastly greater antiquity to this world than that set forth in Scripture: and of the *Infidel*, who, even though you demonstrate the age of the world by the Scriptures, yet will deny their authenticity, and consequently their authority.

Against the system of *Atheism*, whether in its Christianized form, as advocated by Grotius and

Vatabulus; or in its undisguised form, whether after the model of Aristotle or Spinoza, we argued a "*beginning*" of existence to this universe, a small part of which we inhabit, in the following manner: We assumed as self-evident the following propositions, viz: I exist — I am not the author of my existence — Hence, I must be a *created* being. And, the being who gave me existence, must be self-derived, or, like me, derive his existence from another. If the latter, then I argue about him as about myself, and so continue to argue, till I arrive at that being who does exist of himself, and who, consequently, must have always so existed: This Being I call, the ETERNAL GOD. I then transfer this argument to the material universe, thus: the creation of this universe argues *design* — design argues *intelligence*. And, the Atheist admits the existence of mind, of intellect, as well as of matter. Mind, intellect, however, is *superior* to matter. But, matter, of *itself*, cannot give existence to matter: how then, to mind? And, as my own existence, and that of the universe, argues design, and design, intelligence, all must have originated from the will of the Supreme, Infinite Intelligence, the ETERNAL GOD.

Against the system of the *Antiquarian*, we asserted an antecedent antiquity in behalf of the Bible as the text book of Chronology, by the following arguments, viz: —

First, the *coincidence* of ancient profane with sacred *history* —

Second. The same, of the ancient systems of *philosophy*; all of which, until perverted by the Greeks,

were founded upon the knowledge which they derived, first, from the oral traditions of the ante-diluvian Patriarchs, and second, from the written records of the Mosaic cosmogony — and,

Third. The utter failure of all the philosophers of Greece, from the period of Hesiod, Homer, Linus, &c., even Aristotle not excepted, to originate any new system, which, so far from proving the fallacy of the old traditionary philosophy, could not even give a reasonable account of the first principles of which it was constructed. Finally,

Fourth. That what was true of the ancient historians and philosophers, as to the source (*viz.* tradition) whence they derived their knowledge, was true also of Moses; unless, indeed, he wrote by direct divine inspiration — and if *he* did not thus write, as a few generations conduct us back to *the first man*, ADAM, as he could not account for the manner of his *own* existence, and that of the universe which existed *before* him, these facts must have been to him matters of *direct divine inspiration*.

Against the system of the *Infidel*, we argued the authenticity of the Scriptures as bearing the names of their respective authors, including that of Moses, upon the very same ground of evidence which he admits as conclusive in every similar inquiry; e. g., that they have been handed down to us uncontradicted and undisputed — that they were quoted by each other, and by successive writers — because such a literary fraud was not only improbable, but impossible, there being no motive of interest adequate to induce it.

This reasoning, taken as a whole, brought us to the following conclusion : — that the Bible is not only the best, but that it is the only source (and, if the above reasoning be correct, that source is infallible) whence we are to derive information respecting the chronology of the world.

With the ground they prepared before us, the preceding, and all other objections to the contrary notwithstanding, we now proceed in this first lecture to assume the two following propositions, viz :

I. THAT GOD IN HIS INFINITE WISDOM HAS ASSIGNED TO THE WORLD WHICH WE INHABIT, BOTH IN RELATION TO ITS PHYSICAL AND MORAL CONSTITUTION, A LIMITED AND DEFINITE DURATION; and,

II. THAT THIS LIMITED AND DEFINITE DURATION OF THE WORLD, AS COMPREHENDED UNDER THREE SUCCESSIVE DISPENSATIONS, PATRIARCHAL, JEWISH, AND CHRISTIAN, IS A SUBJECT FULLY REVEALED TO GOD'S PEOPLE IN HIS WORD.

"And as He," (Jesus) *"sat on the Mount of Olives,"* (which rose on the east of Jerusalem, ¹ in three peaks, the most northerly of which is the highest point above the city,) *"the disciples came unto him privately,"* (because He had said to them on a previous occasion ² "It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; but to them [i. e. that are without] it is not given, &c.) *"Saying, tell us,"* (as our divinely omniscient teacher who "knowest all things," ³ yea, even "the end from the begin-

1. Zech. xiv., 4. 2. Matt. xiii., 11—17. 3. John xvi., 30. Isa. xlvi., 10.

ning"), "when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

The blessed Jesus, having in the preceding chapter, (xxiii) administered the severest reproofs to the carnal and unbelieving Scribes and Pharisees, closes it with his memorable lamentation over them, in view of that terrific doom at that moment suspended over their guilty heads, as by a hair. At the opening of the twenty-fourth chapter, our blessed Lord, having left the Temple, meets his disciples, who proffer to him their services to show him all the magnificent buildings of the holy city.¹ Immediately thereupon Christ proceeds to utter a declaration of their destined destruction. "Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here (of all the buildings of the Temple) one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down."² These are the "things" more immediately comprehended in the interrogation of the disciples to Christ, regarding *the time* of their fulfillment; but included also his declaration of his *Second Advent*, as contained in the last verse of the preceding chapter, "For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, blessed is he that COMETH (*"ὁ ἐρχόμενος* that is about to come,)"³ in the name of the Lord;" which has an undoubted reference to the following prediction of Hosea, "For the children of Israel shall abide many days *without a king, and without a prince, and*

1. Matt. xxiv., 1.

2. Matt. xxiv., 2.

3: Ramsy's Second Coming, p. 96.

*without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an Ephod, and without teraphim : afterwards, shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king : and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days."*¹ Hence they add, "and what shall be the sign of thy coming?"

But we must here observe, that the disciples "*could not conceive*" that the above predicted ruin of their temple "would ever take place, except with the ruin of the world,"² which they considered (and rightly, too,) would be *simultaneous* with, because *consequent* upon, his coming. Hence the reason why "the sign," spoken of as an object of special inquiry, was considered by them as a sufficient prelude of *both* events.

"In answer, and by way of giving them to understand that much was yet to happen *before* his coming, or the end of the world,"³ the Redeemer proceeds to utter the very elaborate prediction contained in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of St. Matthew's gospel, which, by the way, we here remark, are to be taken together; the twenty-fifth chapter being but a *continuation* of the twenty-fourth; the following synopsis⁴ of which it will be of use here to insert.

1. Hosea iii., 4, 5. 2. Hare's Christ to Return, p. 46. 3. Hare, Ibid.

4. This synopsis of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, I have taken the liberty to transfer to my pages entire, from the very judicious and well-timed exposition of the prophecy contained in them, by the Rev. G. Ember Hare, Rector of Trinity Church, Princeton, N. J., in his recent work, entitled, "*CHRIST TO RETURN*," a work which I would recommend to all

"To preserve his disciples from mistaking for "SIGNS" of his coming, and of the end of the world," *occurrences* which must be *before* the end came, the Savior begins by naming some of these occurrences, viz. :

I. The *rise of adventurers* who would claim to be the Christ, and might be mistaken for Jesus of Nazareth *re-appearing*. [verses 4 and 5 of chap. xxiv.]

II. *Outbreaks* in nature, and among nations. [verses 6 — 8.]

III. *Trials* to the Church. [verses 9 — 13.]

IV. The announcement of the gospel to *all* nations. [verse 14.]

V. *Destruction* to the holy city. [verses 15 — 28.]

VI. *Prolonged disaster and desolation* to the holy land. [verse 29, Luke xxi. 25 — 26.] (after which,)

VII. The Savior proceeds, by declaring that "the SIGN of his coming, and of the end of the world," — "the sign of the Son of Man," — may be looked for when the *occurrences* just mentioned shall *all have come to pass*, and *not* before, [verses 30 — 31.] (He then) *applies* the doctrine he had taught concerning "things which must be *before* the end comes." [verses 32, 33.] — Predicts that the *seed* or *generation* he addresses shall *survive* all these things. [verses 34, 35.] — Declares his *return* will take men by *surprise*. [verses 36 — 39.] — Predicts a *rending* of the most intimate

who love and look for "the speedy appearing of Christ with his saints." I rely on the indulgence of that Rev. Gentleman for the liberty taken in *italicising* some portions of the above "synopsis," and also for the addition of the numerals, references to verses, &c., embraced in brackets.

relations. [verses 40, 41.] — (And,) compares his disciples,

1. To a man whose house was to suffer *attack*. [verses 42 — 44.]

2. To a *head* servant. [verses 45 — 51.]

3. To *ten* virgins. [chap. xxv., 1 — 13.]

4. To *dependants* trusted with capital. [vrs. 14—30.]

The Savior concludes by *depicting* the scene to take place at his *return*. [verses 31 — 46.]

In view, therefore, (as we now come to ask,) of the *interesting occurrences* which, according to the above prediction of Christ, were to take place between the destruction of Jerusalem and the second advent of Christ, together with the end of the world, or present constitution of things : — rather in view of all the dispensations of God to our world, from the creation of man to the final restitution of all things ; as the constantly recurring interrogation of the primitive disciples to their Divine master, *whether we will or not*, forces itself upon our attention, with an accelerated power proportionate to our convictions, defined or undefined, of the tendency of all things to a CRISIS : we come, I say, to ask, shall we attempt to fix upon THE *point of time* in round numbers, upon which we *now stand*, in the successive evolutions of God's dispensations to man ?

At *such* an attempt, we have said, many “ who profess and call themselves Christians,” are shocked. Such an undertaking is denounced as presumptuous. even though we aim at but a tolerable degree of certainty in these premises. There is *an evident popular*

reluctance, as well on the part of professors of religion, as of the mere worldling, to *scan* this subject. Nor, considering the circumstances which *originate* a large proportion of the prevailing disinclination to rely, with any confidence, on deductions of *historic* and *prophetic* chronology, can we profess much astonishment. Of these circumstances, as deserving a passing remark, is,

I. The ABUSE of the subject, *consequent of the prevailing fanaticism which has accompanied it.*

We are reminded of a statement in Mossheim's Ecclesiastical History, that in the tenth century the priests and monks of the Latin Church openly taught to the people the *immediate approach* of the day of judgement, on the ground that the one thousand years millennial rest of the church, spoken of in the Revelations, had then *expired*; and that, spreading itself with amazing rapidity throughout the European provinces, it produced among the people the deepest anguish, consternation, and dismay. But, besides *omitting* to advert to the thick and gloomy mantle of *superstition* which at that time covered the whole of Christendom; the motive of the evident deep laid scheme of the mercenary priesthood who originated the delusion, is also passed over in silence. What, however, were the facts? Simply these — while under this delusion, prodigious numbers of the people flew with the utmost precipitancy to Palestine, as the place destined for the re-appearance of Christ, as the judge of men, the *sacerdotal* and *monastic orders* remained quietly at home; on the one hand, to seize upon the *luxuriant*

lands, and *abundant treasures* of their former occupants and possessors, and on the other, to reduce vast numbers of those who remained to a species of *the most abject ecclesiastical slavery*, under the plea that in *that* capacity they were the servants of God's immediate vicegerents on earth, and could not fail to purchase thereby a mitigation of their sentence from the great Judge.

Numerous similar pretensions, though of *less* notoriety, have transpired at different intervals, and in different countries, from that day to the present, and with like results; i. e., they have produced the conviction that they were the fruits, either of crafty and designing men, or of a spirit of misguided and reckless fanaticism.

But, I would deferentially ask—are we hence to conclude that God's purposes are so deeply veiled in the darkness of uncertainty, as that we dare not “*take in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which he hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began?*”¹ We as deferentially answer, No! We say, “*secret things* belong unto the Lord our God; but things that are REVEALED TO US and to our CHILDREN.”² And now, of that Book called the Apocalypse, and which, according to the *current* view, has been, is now, and ever will be to the Church, a deep and dark enigma: We ask, what is its *name*? “The Revelation!” not the *secret*, but the “REVELATION of Jesus Christ,

1. St. Luke, i., 70.

2. Deut. xxix., 29.

which God gave unto him." But for what purpose? "*To show unto his servants THINGS which must SHORTLY COME TO PASS; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant JOHN.*"¹ And almost the very first words *indited* by the Spirit, and *penned* by St. John in this Revelation, is, "*BLESSED is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this PROPHECY, and keep those things which are written therein.*"² And as of *this* prophetic book, so of all the *other* prophets. "*ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for instruction*" — is designed "*for the edification*" of those "*of the body of Christ,*" who "*speak the truth in love.*"³

At the commencement of this article we adverted to the *abuse* of the subject of prophecy, consequent of the prevailing fanaticism which accompanied it. We now say that this holds signally true of *every prominent prophecy*, FULFILLED OR UNFULFILLED, from the days of Christ down to this time, and so will continue down to "*THE END.*"⁴ Our divine Lord and his Apostles all spake of the *false prophets*,⁵ *false Christ's*,⁶ and *false teachers*,⁷ that would infest the Christian Church in all ages. Of the first and last of these, besides many *false prophets* who appeared be-

1. Rev. i., 1. 2. Rev. i., 3. 3. Eph. iv., 15.

4. Dan. vi., 26; vii., 26; ix., 26; Matt. xxviii., 20; 1 Cor. i., 8; Heb. iii., 14; Rev. ii., 26.

5. 2 Pet. ii., 1; Luke vi., 26; Matt. vii., 15; xxiv., 11, 24; Mark xiii., 22.

6. Matt. xxiv., 5; Mark xiii., 6; Luke xxi., 8.

7. 1 Tim. i., 7; 2 Tim. iv., 3; 2 Pet. ii., 1.

tween the ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem, during the first two centuries, of the principal *heretical* teachers the number that sprung up amounted to about one hundred and forty.¹ Of the *false* CHRIST's who have appeared at different times, and in different places, during the interval from the ascension down to the seventeenth century, there have been between twenty and thirty!² and it is a fact well worthy of observation, that the appearances of these false Christ's in *every* instance, *was preceded by an expectation* on the part of the people, of some approaching CRISIS. Thus it was with the Apostles and Christians *primitively*. They expected that a comparatively *short interval* would elapse between the *First* and *Second* advent. This circumstance, therefore, *opened the way* for the *appearance* of the false Christ's of their day, and exposed them to delusion. Hence the declaration of the Redeemer to them, "*Many* shall come in my name, saying, *I am* CHRIST, and shall deceive many."³ They "shall deceive, if it be possible, the *very* ELECT."⁴

What, then, do these facts argue? Certainly this, viz.: that *every great truth of God*, as they unfold his purposes, and their adaptation to the *successive periods* of his dispensations to "the end," would be *counterfeited* by false pretenders. And shall we, can we say, that *this age and day* is to be *exempt* from the prevalence of such false pretenders? Nay, verily.

1. Simpson Key to the Prop. pp. 142—157. 2. Ibid, pp. 127—142.

3. Matt. xxiv., 5.

4. Matt. xxiv., 24.

Look abroad at this moment. In the far west a standard is raised — and a loud welcome, wafted by every wind that blows, and falling upon the ear like the shrill blasts of a trumpet, invites us to flock around it, as the subjects of the deluded founder of the eternal city, NAUVOO. The fanatical spirit of a Joanna Southcoate lives, and is destined to spread, we cannot now tell to what an extent, in the founder of the recently erected MORMON Empire. Some forty thousand are already collected together in and about the city of Nauvoo, Illinois, from various lands, and are prostrating themselves before the shrine of a mortal, claiming regal equality with our now absent, but long-looked-for, and speedily returning Lord and Master !

Oh ! at *every peril*, we shrink not from raising the voice of admonition ; of raising the beacon of alarm ! We, therefore, proclaim to you in the long-standing predicted admonitory language of Jesus, “ If *any man* shall say unto you, lo, *here* is Christ ; or *there*, behold, he is in the *desart* ;” or, “ behold, he is in the secret chambers ;” “ *believe* it not — *go not* after them.” ¹ No, my brethren ; the King of Zion is still seated on his mediatorial throne, where he is interceding for us at the right hand of God ; and, ere he ascended thither, He deposited in His Church an infallible directory for the conduct of her members, till he come again. Here it is, “ OCCUPY TILL I COME ;” ² in other words, continue in the respective spheres in which providence

1. Matt. xxiv., 26.

2. Luke xix., 13.

hath placed you, being "diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord, "TILL I come again," to "receive you to myself."

To add the greater impressiveness to this reflection, I take the liberty to quote the following from the preface of the Rev. Mr. Hare's "Christ to return," by the Right Rev. L. S. Ives, D. D., of North Carolina. He says : —

In proportion as the mind is animated by a persuasion of success, will be its preparedness for vigorous, patient, and untiring exertion. This is felt to be a principle of such efficacy, as to have been called in to sustain effort and quicken zeal in all great undertakings. Even the religion of the Son of God, instinct as it is with Almighty energy, has not thought this principle unworthy of its regard, in promoting a spirit of magnanimity and endurance in its friends. If we turn to the birth-place of the Christian faith, we may hear the Divine teacher cheering the hearts of the disciples in their hard conflicts with the world, the flesh, and the devil, by the promise of being, at last, *more than conquerors*. His first act, as he led them forth, was an act of triumph over the Prince of Darkness¹ — thus settling their confidence in his power to accomplish the deliverance of his people. : while such acts, to the same end, were constantly repeated before their eyes during his earthly ministry.² And when he opened to them the scenes of bitter trial through which,

1. See *Temptation* of Christ, Matt. iv.

2. Matt. vii., 28; ix., 32, et passim.

for his sake, they must pass — scenes so contrary to their hopes, so overwhelming to their fears — he sought to quiet their alarm, and confirm their wavering trust by revealing to them the scenes of glory that would follow : — “Look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh ;”¹ “Let not your hearts be troubled — *I will come again*, and receive you unto myself.”² True, you shall see me “led as a lamb to the slaughter.”³ Though “despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows,”⁴ and a victim of the most cruel sufferings — bleeding at every pore and writhing in every limb, yet unappalled at the fearful expiation, I shall proceed “to give back to the smiters,”⁵ “my flesh for the life of the world.”⁶ Yes, you must witness “the hour and the power of darkness ;” but “let not your heart be troubled,” the day of my exaltation and of your rejoicing hastens. Soon you shall see me lay aside the priestly garments, the badges of my bloody sacrifice, my deep humiliation ; and gird on the sword of my might. “Death shall be swallowed up in my victory ;”⁷ and in the face of a gazing world I will ascend, “leading captivity captive,”⁸ to “the place of my glory.” Nor is this all : *I will come again* ; and THIS VERY EARTH, which is to witness the scene of my agony, and hear the cry of my distress, shall yet behold the brightness of my coming,⁹ and bend beneath the sceptre of my kingdom.¹⁰ True,

1. Luke xxi., 28. 2. John xiv., 1—3. 3. Is. liii., 7. 4. Ibid, liii., 3. 5. Ibid, i., 6. 6. John vi., 51. 7. 1 Cor. xv., 54. 8. Eph. iv., 8. 9. 2 Thess. ii., 8. 10. Is. ix., 7 ; lxiii., passim. Phil. ii., 10. Rev. i. 7.

"you shall be called before governors and kings for my sake;" "yea, the time cometh, when he that killeth you, will think that he doeth God service."¹ But "let not your heart be troubled;" *I will come again* : will come unto *you* : will endue you with "the *spirit of my glory*:"² "will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist."³ "No weapon formed against you shall prosper."⁴ Yes, "I will *come again*, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you."⁵ "Ye have followed me, and in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."⁶ Such is the enrapturing view unfolded by our Lord to his sorrowing disciples; such the bright vision of final victory, under power of which he left them "to contend earnestly for the faith." The effect was such as might have been looked for. No sooner had he ascended, than the voice of these very disciples, just now sunk in despondency, is raised, as if in echo of his own exulting strain, to the highest note of encouragement. The timid are nerved, the sluggish aroused, the recreant filled with terror, by constant and thrilling appeals to the fact, that "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh:" that He who once "came to visit us in great humility," would soon return in all the majesty of the Godhead, "to call the world from the

1. John xvi., 2. 1 Pet. iv., 14. 3. Luke xxi., 15. 4. Is. liv., 17. 5. John xvi., 22. 6. Matt. xix., 28.

rising up of the sun to the going down thereof: *first*, to gather together his saints unto Him in his everlasting kingdom; and *then* to adjudge the wicked and impenitent to the horrors of an endless punishment.¹

A departure, therefore, from, or a neglect of, the ordinary avocations of life, when induced by a discovery of the above or any other truth, is an evidence that we "hold that truth in unrighteousness,"² and that we are exposed to the danger of falling a prey to the demon of fanaticism.

Here, again, we return to the subject of our more immediate concern; and taking it for granted that we have satisfactorily disposed of this objection against *prophetic exposition* in general, or of *prophetic time* in particular, as predicted of its fanatical abuse; we observe, that the very expression of Christ, "TILL I come," implies, (at least, as present to the mind of the *Father*, though at that precise juncture withheld from the *Son*,) a *fixed and definite time*. But, at this point, the question again returns upon us: Is this fixed and definite time a matter of *revelation*? In other words, CAN WE, DO WE KNOW IT?

We intend, brethren, by God's assistance, to discuss this subject with the utmost candor and impartiality; in order to which, we shall now lay before you *every objection* which, in our judgment, can be adduced as of any weight, against the practicability

1. 1 Thess. v., 2, 3, 4. Acts xx., 32. 2 Tim. iv., 8. 2 Pet. iii., 11 to end. Rev. last two chapters. 2. Rom. i., 18.

of attempting to attain to such certainty in these premises. It is then objected,

I. That the *great diversity of opinion* which prevail among expositors of the historical and prophetic portions of Scripture, in the department of chronology, renders impossible the attainment of any *definite* conclusions, in reference either to the entire age of the world, or of the commencement and termination of particular dispensations. It is further objected,

II. That prophetic time, as, for instance, the seventy weeks of Daniel ix. 25, 26; the "time, times, and half-a-time," of the same prophet, chap. vii. 25; and the twelve hundred and sixty days, or forty-two months of Rev. xi., — &c. are mere expressions, denoting *indefinite periods*, and not *mystical numbers of specific dates*. Hence,

III. It is affirmed that we have no Scriptural data upon which to fix any definite period, as to "THE END;" which affirmation is founded on the following, and similar reasons, viz, :

1. No prophecy, it is said, "directly declares," the great period of restitution as "*far away*," or, indeed, as extending beyond the "*death*" (temporal) of those to whom it was uttered.

2. That "threatenings of *woe*" are denounced against any who presume upon a *delay* of the day of wrath.

3. That this is further evident from those numerous passages which speak of that day as *near at hand*.

4. That both Christ and his Apostles *always evaded any direct answer* to the repeated inquiries of their

followers, respecting this point, and this, for the very obvious reason, that they did not know it themselves. And, finally,

5. That, to suppose a revelation "to mortals" of any definite period in regard to the divine purposes, either *past*, *present*, or *future*, is *inconsistent* with the wisdom and benevolence of the Almighty.

These, we flatter ourselves, will be found to cover the entire ground of objections deserving notice, raised against the scheme we are about to propose ; nor shall we attempt a reply to them consecutively, but proceed to the following preliminaries, as essential to the elucidation of our subject, incorporating answers to each as we advance. And,

I. The source, or sources of *authoritative data* for information in these premises, deserve our most careful regard.

Here, we remark, a wide field of investigation opens before us. We must, however, content ourselves with a simple reference to the two extant sources of dependence for the information we seek, viz. : the annals of sacred and profane writers. Of the annals of PROFANE chronology, the following are the principal : First, the *Egyptian* chronographeon of Syncellus. Second, the *Chinese* records. Third, the *Babylonian* chronology. Fourth, the chronographia of *Manetho*. Fifth, the chronographia of *Africanus*. Sixth, the catalogue of *Eratosthenes*. Seventh, the chronicon of *Eusebius*, and, eighth, the chronicon of *Alexandria*. These, however, will all be dismissed with the single remark, that they are only of service in so far as they furnish

collateral evidence of the verity of sacred chronology, by an exhibit of the events of general profane history, as *coincident* therewith. As we have already demonstrated, whenever they claim an antiquity *antecedent* to that of the Bible, they are fabulous, spurious. ¹

In the department of SACRED chronology, we have the Samaritan, the Septuagint, and the Hebrew versions. Of these, the last, viz., the HEBREW chronology, claims the decided precedence, as will appear from what follows :

1. The *Samaritans*, originally of the stock of the Cuthites, were the descendants of Cush ; transplanted from beyond the Euphrates into Samaria, by Esarhadan, King of Assyria, who appointed over them an Israelitish priest. But even with this advantage, they succeeded, in a measure, to blend idolatry with the worship of the true God. Upon the Jewish restoration under Cyrus, they attempted, but without success, to effect a union with that people. Exasperated at this result, they imbibed a lasting enmity to the Jews ; and, under *Sanballat*, their governor, with *Tobiah* and *Geshem*, after many ineffectual efforts to defeat the reformation under Nehemiah, and having ingratiated themselves into the favor of Darius Nothus, king of Persia, on a visit into Phœnicia, obtained a grant to build on Mount Gerizim, a temple like that at Jerusalem. In after ages, as Samaria now became a common refuge for refractory Jews, the Samaritans were made up principally of apostate Jews and their descendants.

1. See on this subject, Introductory Essay.

But the Samaritans still professed the *Hebrew* religion, and retained a *ritual* service. They, however, retained nothing of the Old Testament Scriptures, but the *five books of Moses*. Hence the Title of their version, — “the *Samaritan Pentateuch*,” which was copied from the Hebrew original.

2. The *Septuagint* version of the Scriptures is a Greek translation of the Hebrew of the Old Testament. It was thus translated for the benefit of those Jews who, under Alexander and Ptolemy Soter were brought into Alexandria, for the building and adorning of the city of that name; they having in time *lost* the knowledge of their own language. The translation was commenced under Ptolemy Philadelphus, about two hundred and eighty years before Christ, the principal editions of which are, the Alexandrian, and those of Philo, Justin Martyr, Epiphaneus, Origen, Lucian, Aldus, Cardinal Zimenes, Pope Sixtus, Thecla, &c.

3. The *Hebrew* Scriptures, therefore, being the foundation both of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint version, has the *precedence* in point of **TIME**. But here comes up the question of precedence in point of **AUTHORITY**, between the chronology of the *Greek*, and that of the *Hebrew* versions, the difference from the *Creation* to the *birth of Christ*, being about one thousand five hundred years!

Now how is this to be accounted for? We answer, in two ways, —

1. The *enlargement* of the genealogies of the Patriarch's &c., either by the *seventy* themselves, or by

some *early* transcribers ; the motive for which, as the learned contend, was, to produce a greater correspondence between the Scriptural antiquity of the origin of the created universe, and that claimed for it by the two Egyptian and Chaldean Annalists, Manetho and Berosus, and this, by way of an off-set against what they considered their high and extravagant pretensions. But, on the other hand,

2. It is generally conceded as incontrovertible, that the *Hebrew* Chronology has also been corrupted ; the motive with the Jew being to furnish a refutation of the claims set up by Christ to be the true Messiah ! Nothing, they well knew, could so effectually prove that he was an *impostor*, as the pretence that the *date* of his nativity *differed* from the *time* specified by the *OLD* prophets. Then also, as most favorable to afford opportunities for such corruptions, was the circumstance that, from the age of the Apostles to the days of Origen, a period of two hundred and thirty years, the Hebrew MSS. were in the exclusive custody of the unbelieving Jews.

This is not the place to furnish the available *proofs* in detail, of these sources of corruption of Sacred Chronology. It must suffice us at present to observe, that while the genuineness of the Hebrew *patriarchal* chronology can be most clearly substantiated against the corruptions of the *Septuagint* ; the Scriptures, taken as a whole, furnish *internal* evidence, as a corrective of the corruptions of the later chronology, by carnal Jews.

With the ground therefore thus prepared before us,

and relying on the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as our guide; and, in view of the objections already adverted to, and all other and similar objections to the contrary notwithstanding, we now proceed to a consideration, more directly, of the two propositions at the head of this Lecture.

I. GOD, IN HIS INFINITE WISDOM, HAS ASSIGNED TO THE WORLD WHICH WE INHABIT, BOTH IN RELATION TO ITS PHYSICAL AND MORAL CONSTITUTION, A LIMITED AND DEFINITE DURATION.

II. This limited and definite duration of the world, as comprehended under three successive dispensations, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian, is a subject fully revealed to God's people in his word.

And now, are any ready to start up as it were and say, "*Can these things be?*"¹ Does the incredulity of any prompt them to denounce the above positions as fanciful, as based upon vain speculations? Yea, more — do they denounce them as presumptuous and fanatical? I intreat all such to pause — to suspend judgment — to hold their minds in abeyance — till we can give an answer for the hope that is in us, in the fear of God.²

In view therefore of this first proposition, we remark, that in Scripture, various forms of speech are used, to designate TIME; one of which, though (as some may suppose) not immediately connected with the subject, yet deserves a passing remark; and may serve, when properly understood, to disabuse the

1. 1 Pet. iii., 15.

2. 2 Cor. v., 12.

mind of a needless (though perhaps a harmless) misapprehension of a very interesting portion of sacred history. It is the term "DAY," as denoting the length of the Great Creator's week of labor and repose, as used in the first chapter of Genesis. "*The evening and the morning* were the FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, &c., day."¹ The question respecting the term "day" as here used, is, whether it is a *natural* or *solar* day of *twenty four hours*, or a PERIOD of *vastly greater length*?

In conducting our inquiries in reference to this interesting subject, we have already remarked, that, reasoning *analogically*, Nature and Providence are gradual in their operations; not like man, who is always for subitaneous violence, but deliberately proceeding, by gradual evolutions, as illustrated in the physical and intellectual powers of man, to unfold to our view, the properties, first, of matter, and then of mind. We now remark, that having applied this line of argument in our Introductory Essay,² *a posteriori*, to the six days of creation, as furnishing evidence founded upon the physiological and oryctological discoveries of Science, that the six days of creation were periods of stupendous length, thereby showing their analogy with the *works* of God; we now resume that argument, *a priori*, with a view to exhibit its entire harmony with what is set forth in the *word* of God.

1. Gen. I., 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; Chap. ii, 2.

2. pp. 47—83.

With the argument of *Analogy* therefore still in view, we proceed now to define the import of the term "*day*," as intended in our view to be understood by Moses in his cosmogony of the creation ; in order to which, we premise that few words in our English version of the Scriptures are more *equivocal* than this very term. In addition to its general acceptance, as signifying a single revolution of the earth round its axis, it will be found to denote,

1. *A revolution of the Earth round the Sun.* Thus, — "after the number of the *days* in which ye reached the land, even *forty days*, (each *day* for a *year*,) shall ye bear your iniquities, even *forty years*." ¹

2. *One thousand years, or a millenary.* Thus, — "a *thousand years* in thy sight are but as *yesterday*." ²

3. *A vast duration of indefinite time*, as that now under consideration ; which is used to denote *the whole of the six days*, mentioned in Chapter first. "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created : in the *DAY* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." ³

It is therefore evidently by *analogy* of reasoning alone, that we can determine whether these terms in the first Chapter of Genesis signify a natural or solar day of twenty-four hours, or periods of vastly greater, but indefinite duration.

With these prefatory remarks we now observe, that

1. Num. xiv., 34.

2. Ps. xc., 4.

3. Gen. ii., 4.

by analogy, the term "*day*," including the whole *seven*, must be understood to embrace, (homogeneously,) the same amount of time whether of *longer* or of *shorter* duration. The ascertained length of any *one* of these days, therefore, will give the length of *each*.

The inquiry thence arising is this:—Upon which *ONE* of the *seven*, must our calculations inevitably rest? We answer, on the *last* or *SEVENTH*, the day on which God *ended* his work, and on which commenced his sabbatical repose.

Of this day, then, we affirm that it cannot be *confined* to a natural or solar day, or to a single revolution of the earth on its axis in twenty-four hours; and for the following reasons:—

1. Our natural week of seven days, each of twenty-four hours, is but a *standing epitome*, so to speak, of the *GREATER WEEK* of the Creator's labor and repose. Hence its appropriation, by Divine appointment, of *six* parts to the former, and of *one* (or the *seventh*) part to the latter, agreeably to the fourth commandment in the decalogue.

Now, ever since the world has been inhabited by man, this standing epitome of the great demiurgic week of the Creator has exemplified a *resumption* after the *expiration* of his sabbatical repose, of his Almighty energy, in the work of a *SECOND* creation. For who, among the millions of the human race ever understood the fourth commandment as enjoining a *total cessation* of all labor at the *close* of the *seventh day of rest*? And how, we ask, is the *epitomised*

week to be made to correspond with its great *archetype*, except that archetype, in the epitomised week by which it was symbolised, pointed to a period of *resumption*.

Finally, on this subject, we remark, that of *each* of the six days of creation it is written, that "*the evening and the morning were the day*." The apostle Paul, in alluding to the six periods of creation, (Heb. i., 2, and xi., 3, and McKnight's com.,) instead of calling them "*days*," calls them *aeons*, a word which our translators render "*worlds*," but which, in its true meaning, signifies "*ages of immeasurable duration, and the created beings which exist in them, or during their course*." These *aeons* were the six days of creation, and all that was produced therein." But respecting the *seventh* day, we find nothing written about "*evening or morning*." On the contrary, we find it expressly written, "*In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die*." Now, we know, that *immediate death did not follow the transgression*. We know also that the penalty was to extend to *all* the sinful generations of men, from Adam, their federal head, to the end of time. "*It is appointed unto men once to die*."¹ "Accordingly, during the *seventh* day, the threat has been literally" *in a course of fulfilment*; and this, in perfect accordance with the revealed character of the Almighty, as the Preserver, Benefactor, Governor, and Redeemer of men.

We conclude, therefore, that the inference thence

1. Heb. ix., 27.

arising is, that the Creator's sabbath of rest *must* exceed that of a natural or solar day ; also, that it has never yet been *interrupted* for one single moment since its commencement ; nor will it be, till the *last hour* of the entire period shall have expired !

Previously, however, to our entering upon the work of assigning to this great day, this sabbath of the Creator's rest, a limited and definite duration, we must claim your indulgence of one preliminary, as indispensable in determining the date of its *commencement*. This preliminary is predicated of the claim of the PRE-ADAMITES, who assert an existence for human beings *anterior* to that of Adam and Eve : in other words, they *deny* that Adam and Eve could have been the FIRST PROGENITORS of the human race.

As a guide to our investigations of this subject, a more tangible form would be, to invest it with its *physico-theological* characteristics. Then it would stand as follows : Are all who claim to belong to the human race of the *same* genus or species ? In other words : Have they a COMMON ORIGIN ?

Here, again, we find ourselves driven back into the vast, yea, almost unbounded fields of ancient annalists, both profane and sacred. Those, however, who heard in lecture form, and who have read our defence of an *antecedent* antiquity in behalf of the sacred writings over that of any or of all others, whether Hindoo, Egyptian, Chinese, Persian, or Etruscan ; and also, of our defence of the divinely inspired and consequent undeniable authenticity of the history of the

creation and origin of mankind as given by Moses, in our Introductory Essay, will not require of us more at this time than simply to observe, that *sacred* history claims a *priority* over that of *profane*, by a period of about three thousand three hundred years; Herodotus being the earliest profane *post-diluvian* historian extant; that he flourished about one thousand years *after* MOSES, and only about four hundred and fifty years *before* CHRIST; and that the chronology of his history bears date only about seven hundred years anterior to the First Advent; all of which shuts us up to the *necessity* of confining ourselves to the cosmogony of the great Jewish historian, Moses, for all our information of this subject, prior to that date.

Now, what is his account of this matter? Simply as follows: In the twenty-seventh verse of chapter first of Genesis, we read, "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." And in the seventh, eighteenth, twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third verses of chapter second, we read, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul. And the Lord God said, it is not good for man that he should be alone: I will make him an help meet for him," &c. The last three verses relate to the *mode* of the creation of Eve.

Now, it is here that we are met with the objection, that Adam and Eve could not have been the FIRST progenitors of the human race. This objection, strange to tell, is founded upon an alleged contradiction of the

very passages adduced above, in proof of the origin of the first human pair. In reply to this objection it is only necessary to say, that in this, as in other instances of the sacred narrative, the difference in these items of history are merely *apparent*, arising from the difference between a *general* and a *particular* account of the *same* transaction. But the objector further urges:—Moses places in the geneological table of Adam only *three* sons, *Cain, Abel, and Seth*; whence then, he asks, came the *wife* of Cain, if Eve, his mother, was the *only woman* living at the time of his *marriage*? Upon this was predicated the hypothesis of Isaac de la Peyrera, A. D. 1655, of the existence of the *pre-Adamites*. To solve this difficulty, it is only necessary to be reminded that the *direct* design of Moses, in the above narrative is, merely to furnish us with the geneology of the sons (not of the daughters) of Adam, link after link, down to the *second* original family of the world, NOAH and his sons, and with whom Cain's posterity *had no connexion*. This is ordinarily the case in all history, as well *profane* as sacred. The *male* line only is important in matters of geneology. The mere circumstance of an *omission* of any reference to females, is no proof that if there were any, that they must have belonged to a family *other* than that of Adam. In addition to this we add, that so far as reliance can be placed upon a *tradition* prevalent among the Jews to this day, to the family of Adam belonged many children, both male and female. Finally, Moses declares, that “Adam called his wife's name Eve, *because SHE* was

the *mother* of ALL living ;” and St. Paul expressly calls ADAM the *first man*, twice over. (See first Corinthians, xv., forty-fifth, and forty-seventh verses.) Admitting, then, the infallible accuracy of sacred history, to what conclusion have we arrived ? Certainly this, that whatever races of men do belong to the human family, we can and must trace their origin back to the one first great progenitor, ADAM.

Still, one important part of our subject remains unanswered. The question, you will recollect, is, are all who *claim* to belong to the human race, of the *same* genus or species ? in other words, have they a *common origin* ? Now, there are two Scriptural marks, by which such a claim may be preferred. The first is, the *erect posture* of the species. “God made *man* UPRIGHT.” But does it hence necessarily follow, that all animals who can walk *erect* are entitled to the above claim ? We wait not a reply. By what other mark, then, is the line to be finally drawn ? Answer, — By the endowment of *intellectual* and *moral* powers. Man, by the inspiration of the Almighty, “became *a living soul* ;” i. e., he was constituted an *intellectual*, a *sentient* being, and capable, also, of volition. Again, “God created man *in his own image and likeness* ;” or, in other words, he was endowed with *moral* qualities, which, however debased and *degraded*, were never, and can never be, *destroyed*.

We have thus referred you to two *Scriptural* marks, by which the above claim may be preferred ; not, however, because they do not find their analogy

in the works of *nature*. Physiologically, we may argue the justness of these claims to a common origin, in the *anatomical* organization and structure of the *human* frame. Not so certain, however, is the argument founded upon the *hereditary* transmission of changes to which the human system may be subject; and we further venture the assertion, that if *reason*, if *intellect*, if *thought* could be ascertained to be lodged within the brain of an Ouran Outang, it would be justly entitled to the above claim, though possessed of a *different* anatomical structure from that of the human frame; while, on the other hand, with all the advantages of such anatomical structure, *totally dispossessed* of reason, of intellect, and of thought, there would be just grounds for a *denial* of said claim. How, then, will you dispose of the *idiot*? To what genus or species does he belong? Has *he* reason, intellect? *Can* he think? With all the anatomical organization, symmetry, and beauty of the human frame, it is said he is a perfect block. Ah, and how did you arrive at this fact? We will dispose of the idiot thus: we will leave him in the hands of that Almighty Being who has been pleased to consign to perpetual imprisonment, during natural life, reason, intellect, thought, within the narrow cell of some *millioneth part* of a cubic inch of his *brain*.

But, there is another case to which some may allude — it is that of a being in human form, by some strange casualty, torn, in infancy, from the parents of its common nature, and left to an uncertain fate in the

midst of a dense forest, where it finds protection and nourishment for years from creatures whose native instinct has moved to succor rather than devour. This secluded being passes thus through the period of childhood and becomes a youth; and, to all human appearance, upon its first recovery by its own native species, it furnishes indications of a total assimilation (except in anatomical structure) to its brutal protectress. But, is the *original* nature of the child, mental or physical, absolutely changed? totally changed? No — in every known instance among the few, where there has been a temporary suspension of the aliments naturally adapted to the nourishment of the human body, or the advantages of mental culture; a restoration to its native atmosphere, and to the influence, physical and mental, of beings of a kindred nature, have never failed to *rekindle* the latent spark of reason, of intellect, of thought, which has long remained dormant. — Like the point of the magnet, it seeks affinity with spirits of a *common* origin; and, being brought in contact with these, you are led to a discovery of emanations of intellect, like fire from the ignited steel — of intellect, we say — not of instinct. Instinctive refinements are limited in their development, according to the various degrees of sagacity prevalent among the various tribes of “the brutes that perish.” You talk of learned dogs, and hogs, and rib-nosed apes. All their astonishing feats, however, can by demonstration be shown as limited to the disciplinary legerdemain of their catch-penny masters.

There is nothing then in history — nothing in the

physiological structure of animals of the *brute* creation, assimilated as they may be in anatomical form, and in feats of instinctive legerdemain, to the erect posture and mental endowment of the human being : — nothing in those strange casualties which, in a few instances may have befallen our nature, that, by any show of consistency can prove either an amalgamation of natures of the *lower* with the *higher* order of created being, or assign to any of the latter an existence *prior* to that of Adam. “God, that made the world,—hath made of *one blood* ALL NATIONS OF MEN for to dwell on all the face of the earth.”¹

All therefore who claim to belong to the human race are of the *same* genus or species ; and, Adam and Eve are the original progenitors of all mankind.

With these general remarks, we proceed now to the inquiry, *what period of time* are we to assign to God's SABBATH OF REST ? When did it *commence* ? When will it *terminate* ? We now answer briefly, that it commenced, when “the heavens and the earth were FINISHED, and all the host of them,”² at the *close* of the SIXTH demiurgic day. As to its termination, we reply, first, *negatively*, that it did not, because it *could not* possibly have closed with any supposed *resumption* of the Creator's labors on the *eighth* natural day : otherwise how are we to reconcile the declared completion (Gen. ii., 1) of the WHOLE EX-

1. Acts xvii., 24, 26.

2. Gen. ii., 1.

TENT of the material universe, with so *early* a creation of something NEW?

Now, in order to determine the date, for the commencement, as already stated in brief, of the sabbatical rest of the Creator, we must once more advert to the six *αιῶνες*, or periods, called "*days*," of the Great Creator's work. Of the Mosaic history of this work, as contained in the first two chapters of Genesis, we remark, that "in the first chapter, no mention is made of the garden of Eden, nor the particular formation of the *woman*, nor of any *negative* command. These circumstances are reserved for the second chapter. The first is a *general sketch* of primeval nature; the second, a *particular sketch* of what more immediately concerned the human race, *anterior* to the introduction of *evil*. The first is a remote view of a great territory; the second, a near survey of a particular portion of it."

"The *whole history* of the CREATION" therefore, "comprises the space of six days or periods: and the cosmogony itself, as the Jewish Rabbins very rightly place the division, reaches to the end of the *third* verse of our present *second* chapter;"¹ thence, to the *end* of the *second* chapter, the history is *supplementary* to that of the first.

Now, uniting the two together, i. e., the general and supplementary histories, we learn the following facts — viz.,

1. That *Adam* was *first* created — placed in the

1. Faber. Vol. I., p. 68.

garden to cultivate it — and received his charge from the ALEIM respecting the interdicted tree; ¹ and this charge, “while” he was “alone, he rigorously observed.” We learn,

2. That, following the creation of Adam, was that of EVE.²

3. We learn, — that the creation of Adam and Eve, the *first* HUMAN PAIR, was the last, the finishing product of God’s handy-work.³ Consequently,

4. That they must have been created at the *close* of the SIXTH day or period, when, immediately upon the celebration of their marriage nuptials, (at which their creator himself presided,⁴) and the announcement of his sacred benediction upon them,⁵ we read as follows — “On the seventh day God *ended* his work which he had made: And he RESTED on the SEVENTH DAY from ALL his work which he had made.”⁶

This, then, is THE *point of time* whence we date the COMMENCEMENT of the Almighty’s sabbatical repose. But to this it may be objected, that, as with the commencement of this sabbatical rest of God, the theory under consideration dates also the commencement of THIS WORLD’S HISTORY; and as, according to the above, it is evident that the sabbatical rest of the Almighty began while Adam and Eve were yet in a

1. Com. chap. i., 26, with chap. ii., 8 — 17.

2. Gen. ii., 18, — 20 — 25.

3. Chap. i., 26, 27, with which com. verses 28 — 31.

4. Gen. ii., 18 — 25. 5. Chap. i., 28 — 31. 6. Chap. ii., 2.

state of *innocence*, it is at variance with the current opinion, which dates the **FIRST YEAR** in the chronology of the world from the *fall of man*. To this objection, however, we have only to reply, briefly, that it rests with the *objector* to prove that the **FALL** did not take place *during the* year commencing with the *paradisaical marriage* of our first parents. What *interval* of time elapsed *between* the creation of Adam and Eve has nothing to do with the subject ; the question pending relating to the **FINISHING** of that work, which *did not* take place *till* the creation of **EVE** ; which, as we have shown, was *immediately* followed by their paradisaical marriage, and the bestowment upon them of the divine benediction.

They were now left alone in the garden, to enter upon that state of *moral probation*, ordained of God as the test of their integrity. Adam, thus wedded to his paradisaical companion, entered upon a *new*, and previously untried field, for the exercise of his *moral* feelings. Eve, wrapped in the ecstasies peculiar to her refined sensibilities, gazed with supreme delight upon the enchanting objects which, scattered in luxuriant profusion above and around her, met her full-orbed eye at every turn ; and, added to this, was the unutterable bliss of social converse between two beings of kindred natures, who as yet “knew no sin.” Yes, as the immortal Milton sang, they were created,

“ For contemplation he, and valor form’d ;
For softness she, and sweet attractive grace ;
He for God only ; she for God in him.”

In a word, “Paradise was a condition, rather of

exquisite passive enjoyment, than of active moral virtue. It was but the infancy of nature, when she lay at rest on a bed of roses, undergoing a kind of rapture; a state of natural fruition — without fatigue, without satiety."

It was under these circumstances, therefore, that the *Tempter* came. Nor, reasoning from *analogy*, could he have granted a *long reprieve* to the innocent occupants of Eden from his infernal assaults. He felt, he knew, that "delays were dangerous." Not to enter into the details of the temptation, and its results, (with which, doubtless, you are all familiar,) the strongest possible motive to transgress, (the very motive which weighed with Satan himself while yet in heaven,) viz. "*Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil,*" was at once presented; predicated of the presumption, that by securing a preponderance in favor of *sense* and *reason* over that of *faith*, on the part of the fair object of his diabolical assault, he could not fail of success. Nor did he err. The declaration of God's word, "*In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,*" to the eye of REASON stood *opposed* to the doctrine of man's *immortality*; as symbolized by "the tree of life," which was planted in the centre of the garden, not only, but which seemed to be corroborated by that very impress of perfection, which stamped all the works of God. Briefly, we mean, that in a *state*, and at the *dawn* of original innocence, "by dint of *Reason* man could not foresee whether he should die or not. The art of the tempter, therefore, consisted in drawing the woman's attention" upon the dangerous

ground of "*Sense and Reason*, separately and abstracted from *from the word of God*. When this was done, all was done : for the moment Eve began to regard *Sense and Reason* as a kind of testimony *distinct and independent* of God, her FAITH was gone." When, therefore, her seducer said, "ye *shall not* surely die," keeping in view the circumstances just adverted to, we can easily discern how her *reason*, coupled as it was with her *desire* to "be as GODS, *knowing good and evil*," triumphed over her FAITH.

Upon the supposition, therefore, that the Paradisiacal state, morally and intellectually, though perfect, yet admitted of an *expansion* of its powers ; "the father of lies,"¹ measuring his prospect of success by the *most suitable season* for attack, invaded this newly erected empire of innocence, when the mind of the tempted one was most susceptible of the creation of a *desire* for instantaneous, universal knowledge. And what period, we ask, better adapted to *that* end than the FIRST YEAR of the Paradisiacal state? To our mind this is conclusive. We proceed, therefore, at once to observe, that the sabbatical rest of the Almighty thus commenced, *was destined to run coeval with the whole period of this world's duration while under the curse*, as divided into and comprehended under the three great dispensations, *Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian* : and, that this whole period was to embrace the definite number of six thousand years.

Here, however, we are met at once with the objection,

1. John viii., 44.

that the Scriptures no where express, in *explicit* terms, any such thing. But admitting this fact, which we do, are we hence to conclude that the Scriptures, in no sense, afford any light upon this subject? By no means; nor, as we shall prove, is the *want* of an explicit declaration of this fact any argument to disprove its full, precise, actual revelation. In order to this, it is only necessary to observe that there are in Scripture several other points of equal, and, indeed, if considered in connection with a knowledge of their adaptation to the wants of the church *practically*, of much greater importance, which are, nevertheless, left to stand upon the *same* ground, as matters of faith and of Christian observance, with the subject now before us. For instance:—The Divine institution of the Christian Sabbath—the Divine right of infants to baptism in the Christian Church—and of both sexes to participate in the symbols of the Holy Eucharist, are received by them upon the grounds of *inference* only, there being *no* explicit authority in Scripture for their belief. If, then, *similar* authority can be adduced from Scripture to prove that God *has assigned a limited and definite period to his sabbatical rest*, is it not the privilege—yea, more, is it not the *duty* of the Christian to know it? Yes, my brethren, and this duty, if I mistake not, rests with a fearfully accumulated responsibility on us, “UPON WHOM THE ENDS OF THE WORLD ARE COME!”¹

This objection to our inquiries removed, and as-

1. 1 Cor. x., 11.

suming, as we now do, that the subject under consideration is fully susceptible of *inferential* proof from the Scriptures, before we advance to the argument as predicated of them, let us cast a sort of birds-eye glance over the opinions which have prevailed in all ages and among different nations, heathen, Jewish, and Christian, respecting this subject. And,

1. The most ancient *Brahmenical* sages, speaking of the creative energies and the repose which ensued, of the Almighty, write thus — “He, whose powers are incomprehensible, having created the universe, was again absorbed in the Supreme Spirit, changing the time of energy for the time of repose.”¹ And, they add, “his night of repose continues as long as his day : ”² i. e., of creative labor. “Similar in principle was the doctrine of the ancient *Persians* and *Etruscans*,” particularly the latter, who affirm, that “the world was formed in the course of six periods ; each period comprehending a millenary : (i. e., a thousand years :) while six thousand years are allotted for a seventh period, viz., that of its duration.”³

2. “Of the *Jewish* writers, Rabbi Ketina, as cited in the Gemara or gloss of their Talmud, said, “that the world endures six thousand years.”⁴ “It was the opinion” also “of the house of Elias,” (supposed to be Elias the Tishbite,) about two hundred years before Christ, “that the world endures six thousand years; two

1. Fab., p. 115.

2. Fab., p. 119.

3. Fab., p. 120.

4. Pym., p. 110.

thousand before the Law, two thousand under the Law, and two thousand under the Messiah." ¹

3. Of the *Christian* writers, St. Barnabas in the first century thus comments upon these words of Moses: "And God made in six days the works of his hands, and he finished on the seventh day, and he rested in it, and sanctified it." This it signifies:—that the Lord God will finish all things in six thousand years; for a day with him is as a thousand years: as he himself testifieth, saying, "Behold this day shall be as a thousand years." Therefore, children, "says he," in six days, i. e., in six thousand years, shall all things be consummated." ² Lactantius says, "Because the works of God were finished in six days, it is necessary that the world should remain in this state six ages, i. e., six thousand years." ³ "Cyprian, A.D. 252 (in his exhortation to martyrdom, Sec. ii., p. 179,) says, that in the creation of the world seven days were spent, and in those seven days seven thousand years were figuratively included;" ⁴ the last seventh of which is to be understood of the millennial rest. Bishop Latimer, (at the head of the Reformation, in his sermon, "The Day of Judgment,") observes, "The world was ordained of God to endure, as *Scripture and all learned men agree*, six thousand years," i. e., to endure in its *present* condition." ⁵ To the above I add in conclusion, the testimony of the distinguished Faber. "The divine Sabbath,"

1. Pym., p. 111. 2. Pym., p. 111, 112. 3. Pym., p. 112.

4. Pym., p. 113.

5. *Ib.*, p. 113.

says he, "is a period of not less duration than six millenaries,"¹ i. e., six thousand years.

Now, respecting these authorities we admit, that the Hindoo sages, with the Persians, do not affix a *definite* period to the Almighty's night of repose. The Etruscans, however, *do* thus fix it. Nor do we refer to these as *direct* proof, but simply to show, that these heathen philosophers expanded the duration of that period which we designate as the sabbatical rest of God, greatly beyond that of a *natural* day. Hence, as such, there is to say the least a most striking coincidence of their views with the opinions both of Jewish and Christian writers.

Let us now see what is to be gathered from SCRIPTURE, on this subject. Here, we at once admit, and that most unhesitatingly, the full force of all those passages, which, taken separately or collectively, represent "times and seasons" as connected with the course of God's dispensations to men, as *hidden* from their view. We will take for instance, the following, by way of illustration:—1st. The question of the disciples to Christ, "*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*" And his answer. "*It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power.*"² 2nd. The following and similar passages, which, we remark, are very numerous. — The prophet Isaiah exclaims, "Howl ye, for the day of the Lord is *at hand.*"³ St. Paul says, "the time is

1. Fab., p. 116., vol. I.

2. Acts i., 6, 7.

3. Isa. xiii., 6.

short."¹ St. Peter says, "The *end* of all things is at hand."² St. James says, "Behold, the Judge standeth at the door."³ St. John, personating Christ, says, "Behold, I come *quickly*."⁴ Christ said to his disciples, "watch, for ye *know not* what hour your Lord doth come."⁵ St. Peter says, "The day of the Lord will come as a *thief* in the night."⁶ And, finally, and above all, Christ says to his disciples, "But of *that day* and *that hour* KNOWETH NO MAN, no, not the *angels* which are in heaven, neither the son, but the Father."⁷

Now, with these passages in view, however much of uncertainty is admitted to accompany our knowledge of the commencement and termination of "times and seasons," all admit that "God knoweth." All admit that He whose divine omniscience sees "the *end* from the *beginning*," "hath *determined the times* before appointed."⁸ But the prevailing opinion among Christians is, that at *no time* and in *no sense* has God ever *revealed* these "times and seasons" to us, nor will the period *ever arrive* in time, when he will so reveal them.

In opposition to this acknowledged popular view of this subject however, there is a small class of Biblical Expositors, who, in perfect consistency with all that can be claimed for the passages above quoted, as shrouding "times and seasons" in the broad mantle

1. 1 Cor. vii., 29. 2. 1 Pet. iv., 7. 3. James v., 8, 9.
 4. Rev. xxii., 12. 5. Matt. xxiv., 42. 6. 2 Pet. iii., 10.
 7. Mark. xiii., 32. 8. Acts xvii., 26.

of impervious darkness ; yet think that, here and there, scattered through the pages of inspiration, they are furnished with *a concentration of light*, opening to *their* understanding a clear and unobstructed view, at least in the *general*, if not in *details*, of the character of the *present*, and the course of the rapidly approaching *future*, dispensations of God to the world and to the church. Nor, as they consider, ought this assumption to subject them to the charge either of egotism or presumption ; those who impugn the same, themselves being judges. For, on what, we ask, is this assumption on our part founded ? Chiefly, we reply, *on that steady, accumulating light*, which the HISTORICO-PROPHETIC pages of the PAST, throws in its divinely illuminating beams, upon the pregnantly ominous *present* and *future* ; and this, upon no other ground than that of the popular admission, that "*history is the interpreter of prophecy.*" We argue, that "if the external dispensations of God be progressive, the light which can illustrate them may be progressive also. The light which, "for instance," revealed the day of Christ to Isaiah, emitted a feebler ray than that which enabled the saints at the era of the Redeemer's birth "to wait for the consolation of Israel, and for redemption in Jerusalem."¹ Why then it is demanded, may not the additional light since that period of more than one thousand eight hundred years, a light which has continued to shine with increasing brightness in the burning but unconsumed

1. Luke ii., 25 ; v. 38.

bush of unerring prophecy, justify "the same eager scrutiny into the time and circumstances of the SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, in these advanced days of human history?"¹ Our position therefore in view of the above, may be gathered from the following, — viz.: —

That even admitting (which is all that can reasonably be asked) that "the times and seasons which the Father" is said to have "put in his own power," as embracing the entire series of his dispensations to men, as revealed in his word, have been heretofore *concealed* from their definite knowledge; yet that the Scriptures encourage God's people to expect the arrival of the period when the seal of prophetic mysteries should be broken; and,

2. That this breaking of the said seal, if applicable to any one dispensation, is especially so to the present.

At this stage of our advance, therefore, in order to assume the affirmative of the position involved in the above, and that we may render the subject before us the more tangible, we shall merge our two propositions at the head of this Lecture into one, thus —

GOD, IN HIS INFINITE WISDOM, HAS ASSIGNED TO THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION OF THINGS IN THIS WORLD A LIMITED AND DEFINITE DURATION; AND HAS IMPARTED A KNOWLEDGE OF THE SAME TO HIS PEOPLE, IN HIS WORD.

Of the former part of this proposition we have already spoken in general terms, and have adduced the prevalent sentiment respecting it in all ages, Heathen,

1. Noel, p. 5, 6.

Jewish, and Christian. We here remark, however, once for all, that the *proof* of it remains to be tested by the result of our subsequent chronological deductions, historic and prophetic. Of the latter part of the proposition, we repeat, that the Revelation of "times and seasons" seems more especially reserved for the faithful in Christ Jesus of the "*last times*," — "the time of the *end*." The historico-prophetic chart of Holy Scripture, as now spread out before us, cannot fail to make known to the Christian of this day of wonders, his duty to examine "whether these things be so," and to fill his heart with unutterable joy at their discovery; "which," to have attempted in "*earlier times*, we admit, would neither have been *illustrative* of the one, nor *productive* of the other."¹ This furnishes us with a KEY, opening to our view the ground of that suspense to which both the old prophets and primitive saints were subjected, by their indefinite knowledge of "THE END." Hence the above and similar passages, already quoted; such as, "the day of the Lord is *at hand*." "The *end* of all things is at hand," "Watch, for ye *know not* when your Lord doth come." "Behold, I come as a *thief*," &c.

The following observations of Bickersteth on the answer of our Lord to his disciples respecting the restoration of the kingdom to Israel prior to his ascension, viz.: "*it is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power*," cannot fail to throw further light on this important part

1. Noel, p. 6.

of our subject. "*Why*," says this writer, "*did Christ withhold the time?*" "Look back," says he to the reader — "You stand on the eminence of eighteen centuries ; see what these centuries have been. Generation after generation, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and reformers, have lived and died. Mark all the conflicts through which the early Christians attained their triumphs — their labors, sufferings, persecutions, martyrdoms. Go on to the rise of Popery and Mahomedanism — see the dark ages — mark the struggles of infant Protestantism, and its subsequent decay — look at the present spread of infidelity among professedly Christian nations." Now, "had the apostles been told all this must *previously* take place — all this corruption must *previously* spread over the world, oh, what *needless despondency* and heart-sinkings must have overwhelmed them ! Eighteen hundred years of deferred expectation — eighteen hundred years of Israel's dispersion and desolation — eighteen hundred years yet to remain of the Gentile monarchies — and eighteen hundred years the treading under foot of Jerusalem ! With what wisdom and love, which marks all his providence to his Church, this dark scene was *kept back !*"¹ Again, "why, also, did he tell them that the times and seasons WERE PUT INTO THE FATHER'S HANDS ? It seems to point out the entire filial confidence they might have in the paternal wisdom and love of all the Divine arrangements," during "a prolonged time of delay, *which it was not for the good*

1. Time to favor Zion, p. 7.

of the Church to know then." ¹ It was, in a word, "that his Church then might have a *waiting* spirit" for the day of the Lord's RE-APPEARING — 'that *expectation* might be kept alive — that all the benefits of a prepared, watchful, prayerful, desiring spirit, might be *continued*, and all the animation of hope, from age to age, fill the souls of his people, *the Son of God was not in the beginning commissioned to give any date of the time.*" ²

But to this exposition of the above it may be replied, yea, it is replied, that it makes the Savior guilty of a *trifling evasion*, in answering the question of his inquiring disciples. At first view, the great lapse of time (more than eighteen centuries) which was to intervene between the propounding of the above question and the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, would seem to give to this inference the semblance of plausibleness. In any other aspect, it merits the severest animadversion. For is time, as measured by the Infinite God, the same that it is with man? Such a supposition would argue that the eternal mind is subject to similar emotions with ourselves, in view of an exercise of "hope deferred!" But who will pretend this? ³ No, my brethren, the infinite wisdom which clothed the answer of Christ to his disciples, is seen in the *effect* (practically) which it produced upon their minds and conduct; and which, as we conceive, was precisely the same as it is with those to whom "the

1. Time to favor Zion. p. 7.

2. Ibid. p. 8, 9.

3. 2 Pet. iii., 8, 9.

times and seasons" are *now* definitely made known. Hope, though deferred, filled them "with joy and holy expectation" *then*, as though "the time of the end," then actually to human view far distant from them, was *nigh* at hand; for, even upon the supposition that the *interval* between the two advents as present to the minds of the New Testament Saints, stretched through a vista of full one thousand eight hundred years, yet if viewed *relatively* with the *entire period* of the destined duration of the constituted order of things under the three dispensations, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian, it stood in the proportion of considerably less than *one third* to the whole period. Nor is this in the least at variance with our ordinary conceptions of the proportion of time future with time past of any given period, as of a year, month, week, or day; -- respecting which, when *less* than one third remains unexpired, it is common to say, that the year, month, week, or day, "is *far spent*." This admitted, and we think we are furnished with an illustration of the subject in hand, when applied to the above interval of the two advents, the second ultimating in the establishment upon earth of the kingdom of Messiah; to which, during this interval, the Gentile or Christian economy was designed as preparatory. Thus the following and similar passages: -- "*The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is AT HAND: repent ye, and believe the gospel.*"¹ Hence the Savior, when about to leave his Church

1. Mark. i., 15.

during this interval, says to his disciples, "A *little while*, and ye shall not see me: And again, a *little while*, and ye shall see me, because, (between my two advents) I go to the Father."¹ And the Apostle Paul, speaking of his return, says, "For yet a *little while*, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry."² Hence also the consistency, prospective of the lapse of this long period of one thousand eight hundred years, of the *warning*, — "Behold I come as a *thief*:"³ and of the *exhortation*, — "*Watch*, for in such an hour as ye think not, the son of man cometh:"⁴ and of the *promise*, — "*Blessed* is he that watcheth."⁵ Finally, hence the exercise, on the part of the Apostles and primitive Saints, of a watchful, prayerful, patient waiting for, this "day of the Lord." The holy ambition which fired their breasts amid their trials of cruel mockings, and scourgings, and deaths, might be seen in their constant "Looking for that blessed hope, the glorious appearing of the Great God, even our Savior Jesus Christ;"⁶ and their "looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God."⁷

What now, I ask, — yes, and ask with religious solemnity — what becomes of the above plea, — that the indefinite replies of our Lord to the several inquiries of his disciples respecting "times and seasons" were no better than trifling evasions, because predicated of

1. John xvi., 16.

2. Heb. x., 37.

3. Rev. xvi., 15.

4. Matt. xxv., 13.

5. Rev. xvi., 15.

6. Titus ii., 13.

7. 2 Pet. iii., 12.

the *ultimate* purpose of God to REVEAL them to his Church? This sentiment, to my understanding, savors of the *scoffing spirit* of these last times,¹ which has for its basis that irreverent and blasphemous assumption of *equality* with Deity, so forcibly brought to view in the words, "*Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself!*"² "But," saith God, "I will *reprove* thee, and set them in order before thine eyes."³

First. It is conceded, that to the prophet Daniel the command was given, to "*shut up* the words, and *seal* the book, even to the *time of the end.*"⁴ And again, "Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are *closed up* and *sealed* till the *time of the end.*"⁵ Also, that to his disciples Christ said, "It is *not* for you to know the *times and seasons*;"⁶ and that of "*that day and hour knoweth no man*, no, not the *angels* in heaven, neither the SON, but the Father."⁷ But, on the other hand, we would ask you to look at the following and similar declarations, — first, of the prophet Amos. "Surely the Lord will do *nothing*, but he *revealeth* his SECRETS unto his *servants* the prophets."⁸ Also of the prophet Habakkuk. "The vision is yet for an *appointed* time; but at the END, it *shall speak* and *not lie*: though it *tarry*, wait for it; because it will *surely come*, it will not *tarry.*"⁹ It is also to be re-

1. 2 Pet. iii., 3.

3. Ps. l., 21.

5. Dan. xii., 4, 9.

7. Mark. xiii., 32, 33.

2. Ps. l., 21.

4. Dan. xii., 4.

6. Acts i., 7.

8. Amos iii., 7.

9. Hab. ii., 3.

collected that the shutting up of the words, and the sealing of the Book of Daniel was *limited*; "EVEN TO," or "TILL, the *time of the end*." ¹

In accordance therefore with these declarations, the last canonical prophet of the New Testament, viz., St. John, is thus directed, — "SEAL NOT the sayings of the prophecy of *this* book, for the *time is at hand*." ²

Now, if we can place our finger upon *the time when*, and show through *whom*, and the *circumstances* under which the very "SECRET" of which the prophet Amos spoke *was* revealed to the faithful, we shall have fully established the point, that "the times and seasons" have been and are, in these last days, *disclosed* to the CHURCH.

As is now generally admitted, (which admission is based upon the general opinion of the fathers — Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, &c., and who are followed by the moderns, Mill, Le Clerc, Basnage, Lardner, Tomline, Woodhouse and others,) the Apocalypse was written A. D. ninety-six. In the first verse and first chapter of that book, we read thus — "THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST, WHICH GOD GAVE UNTO HIM." Now, we admit all that can be claimed for the passage, Mark. xiii., 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no; not the angels which are in heaven, NEITHER THE SON, but the Father." We admit that, when the disciples proposed to Christ the question regarding *the time* of

1. Dan. xii., 4, 9.

2. Rêv. xxii., 10.

the Restoration of the kingdom to Israel, "the times and seasons" *were* "a HIDDEN MYSTERY — not given (even) to the Son to reveal:"¹ and that too, without at all derogating (as a late writer on this subject supposes²) from his divine prerogatives. "By the son not knowing, we are clearly taught that he had a real human mind, as well as a real human body. As man, his Divine omniscience was no more put forth than his Almighty power. But as time rolled on, further light was to be given on this point."³

And now, all the Apostles, save one, having "fallen asleep in Jesus," in the A. D. ninety-six, that knowledge of "the times and seasons previously withholden from the Son, is fully revealed to him. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God (who, as the Father, ONLY, before possessed a knowledge of) GAVE UNTO HIM," (the Son.)

But, you will ask, was not this Revelation, thus given to the Son by the Father, shut up in his *own* bosom? We answer, no. St. John was at that time "in the isle that is called Patmos," "on the Lord's day;" and, being "in the Spirit," "Jesus Christ," who had just received his revelation from the Father, "*sent and signified* it by his *angel*, unto his servant, JOHN."⁴

But, you will say, this Revelation was not designed to pass from St. John to *others*. — Read the following :

1. Bickerstith's time to fav. Zion. p. 8.

2. Ramsey's second coming, pp. 56 — 58.

3. Bick. time to fav. Zion, p. 8.

4. Rev. i, 1.

“John *bare record* of the word of God, and of the *testimony* of Jesus Christ, (which testimony is the spirit of prophecy,) and of *all things* that he saw.”¹ But this Revelation did not relate to things *future*? Yea, verily. For St John was commanded thus — “Write the things which thou *hast seen*, and the things which *are*, and the things which *shall be* **HEREAFTER.**”²

True, St. John did not at first understand what was thus revealed to him of the past, the present, and the future. “And he *wept much*, because no man was found worthy to open, and to read the book, neither to look thereon.” But, at that auspicious moment, “one of the Elders said unto him, weep not: behold, the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to **OPEN** the book, and to **LOOSE** the seven seals thereof.”³ Blessed be God!

We now affirm, brethren, that, with this representation corresponds *the general tenor of God's word, historic and prophetic, in determining, with the utmost precision, the age of the world, from the creation and fall of man, down to the consummation of all things.*

To show this therefore, is the task now before us, in the execution of which, we premise,

1. That, in God's word is to be found a **GOLDEN CHAIN OF MEASUREMENT** to the entire sabbatical day of God's rest, the successive links of which, though of unequal lengths, are all immutably bound together by

1. Rev. i., 2.

2. Rev. i., 19.

3. Rev. v., 2—5.

him who "hath determined the times before appointed." ¹ These determined times taken collectively, embrace a *long period*, only *one* portion of which, as brought to view in the prophetic vision of Daniel in the third year of Cyrus king of Persia, evidently implies. "The thing revealed," it is said, "*was true, but the time appointed was long.*" ²

This golden chain we shall now divide into two parts, as follows: The first, embracing the interval between the creation and fall of man, to the commencement of the prophetic seventy weeks of Daniel, and which forms the basis of *historic* chronology; the second, extending thence to the final "restitution of all things," ³ or to the six thousandth year of the world, and which we denominate the chronology of *prophecy*.

But, with a view to a satisfactory *issue* in the prosecution of our inquiries of this subject, it is indispensable that we determine upon a *criterion of measurement* of time, both *past* and *future*;—the questions,—are the years in sacred time, *historic* and *prophetic*, the same? Does time, as measured by *sacred* chronology harmonize with our *solar* year?—meeting us at every turn. He therefore who, in an attempt to define the point of time upon which we *now* stand, in the successive dispensations of God to man, would avoid a *confirmation* of those prejudices already so universally obnoxious to such an attempt,

1. Acts xvii., 26.

2. Dan. x., 1. (Margin, *great*.)

3. Acts iii., 21.

and also the imputation of "darkening council by words without knowledge,"¹ must institute a distinction (if any there be) as well between the criteria of measurement to time *historic* and *prophetic*, as between time *sacred* (or Jewish) and *solar*.

Chronology, as a science, possesses few attractions. It is ordinarily regarded as a dry and uninteresting study. Compared with other sciences, it has not received, except in a few instances, any attention at all entitled to the name of patient, laborious, and minute research. As evidence of this, we have but to advert to the extreme and variant conclusions of those who have already occupied this field. Dr. Hales presents a formidable list of the disagreement of Chronologists on the *Æra* (B. C.) of the creation, which embraces a hundred and twenty different opinions, which, he says, might easily be swelled to three hundred; and the extreme dates of six thousand nine hundred and eighty-four years B. C., and three thousand six hundred and sixteen years B. C., exhibiting a difference of above three thousand three hundred years!

With these facts before us, we think we may legitimately infer, that the science is comparatively little studied and less understood. Still, if we mistake not, it is clearly susceptible of explication, even to ordinary minds. It is only when we invest the results of protracted and laborious toil in the departments of letters with the garb of mysticism, (than which none other will better serve the purposes of illustration

1. Job. xxviii., 2.

than that now before us,) that we place them beyond the reach of general, *practical* utility. But, actuated by the principle, that the object of all human attainments is, *to make things plain*, while it excludes all regard to the pomp and outward circumstance of human attainments; (an idol which, as the natural offspring of that knowledge which puffeth up,"¹ receives the homage of its thousands and its tens of thousands;) it will seek to divest the subject of all unnecessary appendages, by reducing it to the narrowest available limits. Nor is it at all necessary to *accuracy* in our conclusions, that we explore *every plot of ground* in the field of chronological science, by those who have gone before us. Indeed, to a mind not previously fortified by a degree, greater or lesser, of *unquestionable* data, "confusion worse confounded" will be the result of further toil. This is inevitable, when history, the *basis* of chronology, abounds with *inaccuracies*. And when this is the case with such writers as the great Jewish historian Josephus,² and (though to a much more limited extent) to the profoundly learned Archbishop Usher;³ it more than suggests the necessity of the greatest caution in relying upon their deductions, and shuts us up to the alternative of studied discrimination in the use of all *human* helps, and a resting of ourselves and the merits of our investigations, upon the infallible autho-

1. Cor. xiii., 1.

2. Prideaux, vol. i., pp. 174, 382; ii., 65, 68, 305; iii., 58, 71, 135, 199, 207, 240, 241, 400, 401, 414, 416; iv., 58.

3. Prideaux, vol. i, 430, 434; ii., 45; iii., 206.

rity of the *historic* and *prophetic* records of God's word. Upon this ground exclusively, we rest the merits of our cause. Not that we do not respect human science — not that we have not examined human systems — but that we believe the conflicting opinions of men in these premises, while thus subservient to evidence a too great resting upon uninspired aids in their investigations, are also designed to illustrate the final purpose of God to "*choose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:* THAT NO FLESH SHOULD GLORY IN HIS PRESENCE.¹ This end, humiliating though it be to the pride of human greatness, awaits all speculative systems not *subservient* in their nature and design, to the inspired word: nor shall we accept of the proffered aid even of these, except in so far as, by the coincidence of their deductions with the statements of that word, they afford collateral evidence of its truth.

It is in this strictly subordinate sense that we now proceed to a developement, in brief, of the progress of astronomical science in furnishing a criterion for the measurement of time, as preparatory to the proof of the coincidence of solar with sacred time, in determining the age of the world.

Chronology treats of the *divisions* of time, rather

1. 1 Cor. i., 27.

than of time in the *abstract*. These divisions of time respect two things, — first, *duration*, e. g., a year, a month, a day, &c., and second, *succession*, e. g., the year 1842 is the 66th in the order of succession from the declaration of independence of these United States. A given period of time however, is only determinable by affixing a *definite length* to the year, month, week, day, &c. And for this we are dependent, partly on our internal perceptions of time, as produced by the regular and uniform motions of certain external objects, but principally on the *motions* of the objects themselves ; e. g., the motions of those two great celestial bodies, the *sun* and the *moon*. These, by their regular and uninterrupted movements from age to age, have induced such astronomical observations of their respective revolutions even from early antiquity, as finally to ultimate in the establishment of accurate and unalterable measurements of the duration of time ; the revolutions of the *sun*, determining the length of the *year*, and those of the *moon*, the *month*, and *day*. Then also, as these only answer the purposes of measuring time by its *larger* divisions, for the conveniences of social life, the smaller divisions of *hours*, *minutes*, *seconds*, &c., have been adopted. Hence we denominate the larger divisions of time the *natural*, and the smaller, the *social*. It is also well to observe, that *natural* divisions of time are only determinable by *astronomical* science ; while its other divisions (e. g., those established by law and custom) lay exclusively within the province of *history*, and which we call, its *civil* divisions. Still, the astronomical divisions of

natural time cannot determine the length of any *given period*, separate from its connexion with its *civil* or *historical* divisions. Hence, their inseparable dependence, the one on the other.

Astronomy, as a science, has finally attained to such a degree of perfection, as not only to supply the deficiencies of that vagueness which attends the measurement of time by the *seasons*, but to determine that the precise length of each solar year is three hundred and sixty-five days, five hours, forty-eight minutes, forty-five seconds and thirty thirds. In historical Chronology, however, the more minute parts of the year as above are omitted, till the portions amount to twenty-four hours, or an *intercalary* day; at the recurrence of which, it adds to the then present year one more day, making it three hundred and sixty-six. Hence the distinction between the intercalary or *leap* year, and the *common* year. Astronomers also institute a distinction between the *tropical* and *sideral* solar year; the former of which is described by the motions of the sun between the tropics, and the latter, the time it requires to reach the same star, (the fixed stars, during the tropical revolution of the sun having had a motion of their own,) at which it was observed at the beginning of its revolution. But as the difference between the two years amounts only to twenty minutes, twenty-five seconds, and thirty thirds, it does not affect the periods of time in *general Chronology*. As to the point at which the natural year begins, there is no agreement among different nations, — some commencing it in the spring, and others in summer.

The solar year, being divided into twelve equal parts, constitutes the twelve *solar months*, which is the time required by the sun to pass through the twelve signs of the Zodiac, making each month to consist of thirty days, ten hours, twenty-nine minutes, forty-seven seconds and thirty thirds.

The *Lunar* year consists of the twelve revolutions of the moon, each from one new moon to another, which constitute the Lunar *months* ; and these twelve revolutions being again divided into *four* parts, are the four changes in the phases of the moon during its revolution through the signs of the *Ecliptic* ; and are called the new moon, the first quarter, the full moon, and the last quarter. The lunar *month* astronomically amounts to twenty-nine days, twelve hours, forty-four minutes, three seconds and twelve thirds ; and the *year* to three hundred and fifty-four days, eight hours, forty-eight minutes, thirty-eight seconds and twelve thirds. The excess of length of the solar over the lunar year therefore is, ten days, twenty-one hours, no minutes, seven seconds, eighteen thirds.

This year, adopted by the *Arabians*, forms the measurement of time of the *Mohammedan Era*. The excess of its fractions, when they amounted to a day, upon the improvement of *Arabian* astronomical science, was made *intercalary* ; eleven of which was annexed to a cycle of thirty years, which cycle contained eleven leap years of three hundred and fifty-five days ; which leap years are, the second, fifth, seventh, tenth, thirteenth, fifteenth, eighteenth, twenty-first, twenty-fourth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-ninth. The

excess of the ten days, twenty-one hours, &c., of the solar over the lunar year, makes thirty-two of the former, equal to thirty-three years and four or five days of the latter. Indeed, according to Prideaux, the Arabs, from the time of Mohamet, have used a year *purely lunar*, and the Turks do the same in imitation of them.¹

We assume, then, that the solar year (minus the fractions, which do not enter into the historical calculations of time) of three hundred and sixty-five days, *is the standard of measurement for all chronological deductions in the department of PROFANE history*. Still, it may not be uninteresting to an inquiring mind to spread before him a brief outline of the progressive developements of astronomical science, which has resulted in furnishing at our hands, so accurate a criterion for the determination of chronological epochs.

But before entering upon this subject it will, perhaps, be well to furnish the following conjecture as to the probable length of the *ante-diluvian* year, from the pen of the learned Shuckford. He observes,

“It is something difficult to say, of what length the year was, which was in use in the early ages. Before the Flood, it is most probable that the civil and solar year were the same, and that three hundred and sixty days were the exact measure of both. In that space of time the Sun made one entire revolution: it was easy and natural for the first astronomers to divide the circle of the Sun’s annual course into three hundred and

1. Prideaux. vol. ii. p. 42.

sixty parts, long before geometry arrived at perfection enough to afford a reason for choosing to divide circles into that number of degrees. All the time of the antediluvian world, chronology was fixed and easy, for a year could be more exactly measured than it now can.

“At the Flood the Heavens underwent some change; the motion of the Sun was altered, and a year, or annual revolution of it became, as it now is, five days and almost six hours longer than it was before. That such a change had been made,¹ most of the philosophers observed, and, without doubt, as soon as they did observe it, they endeavored to set right their chronology by it: for it is evident, that as soon as the solar year became thus augmented, the ancient measure of a year would not do, but mistakes must creep in, and grow more and more every year they continued to compute by it.”²

But, the best endeavors of these early philosophers to this end were extremely defective, as may be inferred from the following brief, but accurate summary of Dr. Hally, respecting the state of astronomical science in these remote ages. He says,

“The astronomy of the ancients is usually reckoned for one of those sciences, wherein the learning of the Egyptians consisted; and Strabo expressly declares, that there were several universities in Babylon wherein astronomy was chiefly professed; and Pliny tells us

1. See Plutarch de Placit. Philos. lib. ii., c. 8, lib. iii., c. 12, lib. v., c. 18; and Plato Polit. p. 174, 175, 269, 270, 271; and Laertius in vit. Anaxagor, lib. ix., seg. 33. 2. Vol. i., p. 8.

much the same thing. So that it might well be expected, that where such a science was so much studied it ought to have been proportionably cultivated. Notwithstanding all which it does appear, that there was nothing done by the Chaldeans older than about four hundred years before Alexander's conquest, which could be serviceable either to Hipparchus or Ptolomy, in their determination of the celestial motions ; for had there been any observations older than those we have, it cannot be doubted but the victorious Greeks must have procured them as well as those they did, they being still more valuable for their antiquity. All we have of them is only seven eclipses of the Moon preserved in Ptolomy's Syntaxis ; and even those are very coarsely set down, and the oldest not much above seven hundred years before Christ ; so that, after all the fame of these Chaldeans, we may be sure that they had not gone far in this science. And though Callisthenes is said by Porphyry to have brought from Babylon to Greece observations above one thousand nine hundred years older than Alexander, yet the proper authors making no mention or use of any such, renders it justly suspected for a fable.¹ What the Egyptians did in this matter is less evident, because no one observation made by them can be found in their countryman Ptolomy, except what was done by the Greeks of Alexandria, under three hundred years

1. Callisthenes's account may not be a fable ; the subsequent authors neither mentioned nor used these observations, because they were in truth such sorry ones, that no use could be made of them.

before Christ. Therefore, whatever was the learning of these two ancient nations, respecting the motions of the stars, it seems to have been chiefly theoretical ; and I will not deny, but some of them might very long since be apprised of the Sun's being the centre of our system, for such was the doctrine of Pythagoras and Philolaus, and some others, who were said to have travelled into these parts.

“From hence it may appear, that the Greeks were the first practical astronomers, who endeavored in earnest to make themselves masters of the science, and to whom we owe all the old observations of the planets, and of the Equinoxes and Tropics. Thales was the first who could predict an eclipse in Greece, not six hundred years before Christ ; and without doubt it was but a rude account he had of the motions ; and it was Hipparchus who made the first catalogue of the fixed stars, not above one hundred and fifty years before Christ ; without which catalogue there could be scarce such a science as astronomy ; and it is to the subtilty and diligence of that great author, that the world was beholden for all its astronomy for above one thousand five hundred years. All that Ptolomy did, in his Syntaxis, was no more than a bare transcription of the theories of Hipparchus, with some little emendation of the periodical motions, after about three hundred years interval ; and this book of Ptolomy was, without dispute, the utmost perfection of the ancient astronomy ; nor was there any thing in any nation before it comparable thereto ; for which reason all the other authors thereof were disregarded and lost, and

among them Hipparchus himself. Nor did posterity dare to altar the theories delivered by Ptolomy, though successively Albategnius and the Arabs, and after them the Spanish astronomers under Alphonsus endeavored to mend the errors which they observed in their computations. But their labors were fruitless, whilst from the defects of their principles it was impossible to reconcile the Moon's motion within a degree, nor the planets Mars and Mercury to a much greater space."

In confirmation of the above we remark, that the *early* Egyptian and Babylonian astronomers, with those of the Medes, all failed in affixing any definite data for the measurement of solar time. Indeed, the first recorded effort to this end was that of "Assis, a king of Thebes, in Egypt,"¹ who reigned about a thousand years after the flood," at which time the civil year was made to consist of three hundred and sixty-five days. The Egyptians were followed by the Babylonians; but their year counted only three hundred and sixty days, till after the commencement of the reign of Belus, or Nabonassar, about sixteen hundred years after the flood. Hence the commencement of the Nabonassarean Era, the years of which agree exactly with the Egyptian, except that the former commences in winter, the latter in autumn; and "the ancient

1. See Plat. de Placit Philos, l. ii., c. 8; l. iii., c. 12. l. iv., c. 18: and Plato Polit., p. 174, 175, 269, 270, 271; and Laert. in vit. Anax. l., ix., seg. 33. (*Shuck.* vol. i., p. 8.)

year of the Medes is the same with the Nabonassarean."¹

The *Brazen Age*. next to the time of Jupiter ;² and the *Era of Sesostins*,³ not being material to our present purpose, will be passed over without further notice.

Of the progress of astronomy, in determining the *fractions* of a year over three hundred and sixty-five days, if reliance is to be placed upon Dr. Hally's statement of the ancient astronomers as above, Thales, the Grecian philosopher, who flourished about the fiftieth year of the Nabonassarean Era, was the first of that nation who attempted to correct the Greek year. "He learned in Egypt that the year consisted of three hundred and sixty-five days." But even this correction was not immediately received all over Greece ; for Solon, in the time of Cræsus, king of Lydia, was ignorant of it."⁴ It was, according to Strabo, reserved for Plato and Eudoxus, near two hundred years after the time of Thales, to find out the deficiency of almost six hours in his year ;⁵ and, even this improvement, Dr. Hally states that before Hipparchus, who flourished only about one hundred and fifty years before Christ, there could be scarce such a science as astronomy, he having made the *first* catalogue of the fixed stars, such a catalogue being indispensable to minute astronomical calculations ; and that to him the

1. Shuck. vol i., p. 9.

3. Ibid., p. 125.

5. Strabo 2. xvii., p. 806.

2. Shuck. Con. vol. iii. 78.

4. Ibid., Con. vol. i., p. 10.

world was beholden for all its astronomy for above one thousand five hundred years. Finally, as the learned astronomer Hally states, it was reserved for Ptolomy, in his *Syntaxis*, about three hundred years after Hipparchus, to carry that science, as based upon his theory, to the highest point of perfection that it ever attained under the ancients.

From the preceding, however, it is evident that the Greeks were by no means the "pioneers" of astronomical science. In fact, their earliest mode of chronological computations, was by *generations*, three of which, at thirty-three and one-third years each, equalled one hundred years. Hence, Pherecydes and Cadmus, of Miletus, the two most ancient historians of the Greeks, who flourished about five hundred years before Christ; and sometimes, even Herodotus,¹ who, by the way, furnishes a rule by which to determine said computations,² adopted "this very natural, but very indefinite mode." Newton, in his "*chronologia veterum emendata*," however, only allows from eighteen to twenty years, as the average of the reigns of their kings, three of which, at sixty-six years, makes a difference from the above of thirty-four years; while on the other hand, Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, fixes the average of each generation at thirty-six and a half years.

The science of astronomy among the Greeks, between the times of Solon and Hipparchus, a period of about four hundred and forty years, was exceedingly

1. Herodotus, l. i., p. 184.

2. Ibid, l. ii., p. 144.

vague and undefined. The *Attic* or *Athenian* lunar year included twelve months, numbering alternately twenty-nine and thirty days. But after fruitless attempts by Meton, about four hundred and thirty years before Christ; and by Callippus, about one hundred years later, to effect a correspondence between lunar and solar time, they finally, "mistaking a lunar month to consist exactly of thirty days, in compounding their year of twelve of them, made it amount to three hundred and sixty-five days." Subsequently, however, upon the observance of their festivals, especially when connected with the Olympiads, as the time for celebrating their games, "being the first full moon after the summer solstice, it always fell in the compass of one lunar month, either sooner or later in the solar year; and there being just four years between Olympiad and Olympiad, this necessarily made these years to be solar years; and cycles, and rules of intercalation were invented of purpose to bring them to it." Hence, "although they might measure their months by the motion of the moon, they always regulated their years according to that of the sun."¹

Besides the *Attic* or *Athenian*, there is also the *Macedonian* calendar; which, though it differed from the above in the names of the months, yet in other respects it corresponded with it, except that the former began with the winter solstice, and the latter with the

1. Prideaux, vol. ii., pp. 41, 42.

autumnal equinox. It was used principally in those Asiatic States founded by Alexander's generals.

In A.D. 681, at an *Æcumenical Council* of the Greek or Eastern Church, the birth of Christ was fixed at the five thousand five hundred and eighth year from the Creation. This era was adopted as the *civil* mode of reckoning by the Oriental Churches, and also by the Greek Emperors, upon the rejection of the "Consular Era," and continued in use down to the time of Peter I., A. D., 1700, when the Christian Era, (the Julianogregorian year,) then in use throughout all Europe, was adopted in its place.

The *Era of the Seleucidæ* is founded upon the conquest of Babylon and the erection of a powerful monarchy under Seleucus, one of the most valarous generals of Alexander; and falls in with the first year of the one hundred and seventeenth Olympiad, or the last half of the year three hundred and twelve, and the first half of the year three hundred and eleven, B. C. It is mentioned in the Books of the Maccabees, and as connected with the history of Asia and of the Christian Church during the middle ages, it is sometimes used by the Christian Fathers.

Of the *Cecropian Era*, and *Parian Chronicle*, introduced into England from the Levant by William Petty in the form of a tablet of Parian Marble, about A. D. one thousand six hundred and twenty-eight, and upon which was engraved a short chronicle of Grecian history, which commences with, and marks the date when, Cecrops first came into Greece; though at first considered as a safe guide in the de-

partment of Grecian Chronology; yet its authenticity has been so undermined by the pen of the learned Robinson, that it has now fallen into comparative desuetude.

The *Consular Era* just alluded to, which was regulated by the succession of two Annual Consuls, was the only mode of reckoning in the business of civil life among the Romans. It commenced about five hundred years B. C., and terminated by an ordinance of Leo the Philosopher, between A. D. eight hundred eighty-six and nine hundred and eleven.

The *Olympiads* were of Roman origin, and commenced at an early period. The first Olympiad however is dated from Coroebus, who flourished B. C., seven hundred and seventy-six, he being the first victor in those games to whose honor a statue was erected.

Prior to the time of Julius Cæsar, the Roman year, which was Lunar, and introduced by Numa Pompilius, consisted of three hundred and fifty-five days. Thus it continued, till the time of the Decemvirs, when a change took place in the order of the months, an intercalated month of twenty-two days every two years, and one of twenty-three days every four years being introduced, with a view to harmonize the Lunar with the solar year. But even with this improvement, though it agreed with the Tetraeteris of the Athenians, yet it exceeded by four days both the Attic Cycle and four Julian years. In this imperfect and confused state it remained for years, subject to the caprices of the College of Priests, who either lengthened or diminished the year, as best served their

mercenary ends. Upon the accession of Julius Cæsar to the Roman throne, however, an attempt was made to reform the Calendar. For this purpose the emperor selected Sosigenes, according to Pliny, but Marcus Flavius, according to Macrobius. This reformation commenced in Cæsar's fourth consulate, B. C. forty-five, and the seven hundred and ninth from the building of the city. The preceding year, (which, from the endless confusion that arose from the difference in the number of days of the several months, together with the introduction of the intercalary months, was styled by Macrobius, the year of confusion,) ending on the twenty-ninth of December, the *New Calendar* commenced on the first of January, as above.

The Julian year is *solar* time, and consists of three hundred and sixty-five days and six full hours, which six hours making in four years one intercalary day, is added to the above every fourth or leap year. Even this year, however, had its defects. For, in its subsequent division into fifty-two weeks of seven days each, which gave only three hundred and sixty-four days to the year, it overran the fifty-two weeks in *common* years one, and in *leap* years two days. Nor was this all. It exceeded the true time by eleven minutes, fourteen seconds, and thirty thirds. This it was found by the course of the sun after the lapse of a century amounted to about ten days, and hence, that it materially affected the time, designated in the Julian Calendar for the celebration of Easter, viz., the twenty-first of March, which always fell on the first Sunday after the full moon immediately succeeding

the vernal equinox, and that in the sixteenth century the time was anticipated by ten days.

Finally, under Pope Gregory XIII., in order to obviate the recurrence of a like difficulty, Aloysius Lilius, an eminent astronomer of that period, reformed the Julian Calendar by throwing ten days out of the month of October of one thousand five hundred and eighty-two, by which process the first of January ensuing was made to coincide with the right point in the sun's motion. This, however, gave to that year only three hundred and fifty-five days. Hence, in order to prevent the recurrence of a similar difficulty by the above fractions of the Julian over the true solar year, it was determined that every hundredth year for three centuries in succession, which, according to the Julian Calendar would be leap years, should be *common* years, but for the fourth century a *leap* year. Hence the Juliano-Gregorian year, or *new style*. It was not, however until A. D. one thousand seven hundred, that the German Protestants consented to adopt the New Calendar, which example was afterwards followed by Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland; by England in one thousand seven hundred and fifty-two, and by Sweden in one thousand seven hundred and fifty-three. The Russians have always adhered to the *Old* Calendar.

The ancient *Persian* astronomy attained to great accuracy in the adjustment of solar time, their common and leap years agreeing precisely with those of the *Julian* year; with the exception that, as the new year, by their mode of intercalation, always fell on the

day of the Vernal Equinox, the Arabian astronomers of the age of Malek Schah, (or Djelaleddin) gave it the precedence.

Some have supposed that at this time the above year formed the *civil* mode of reckoning time among the Persians. This supposition however can scarcely be reconciled with the fact, that Persia was now under the Seldjukian Dynasty, of which Malek Schah (himself an Arabian) was king. The *lunar* year of the Arabians formed the civil mode of reckoning time in all countries subjugated to their arms. The greater probability is, that this solar year of the Persians was coeval with the period of Zoroaster, Malek Schah, a devoted lover of astronomical science collecting his knowledge respecting it from a festival perpetuated among that people in commemoration of "the day of the Vernal Equinox," called also "Naurus," or New years day.

Of the progress of astronomy as herein set forth we have observed, that, in *historical Chronology*, the more minute parts of the solar year are omitted, until the fractions, amounting as they do every fourth year to one day, makes an *intercalary* day, which, being added thereto, is a *leap* year. Hence the distinction between the *common* and *intercalary* year. Hence also the origin of *Cycles*, to harmonize the *Lunar* with the *Solar* year. It is perhaps necessary also again to observe, that the fractional difference between the *tropical* and *sideral* solar year, does not affect the periods of time in general Chronology. And, in view of the difference between the original solar *Ju-*

lian year, and the *Juliano-Gregorian year*, being that of *ten days*, at the lapse of every century; computing the duration of the world under the present constituted order of things at six thousand years, the same remark may apply: For, be the result of any established Cycle harmonizing Lunar and Solar time *within* that period whatever it may, when carried *beyond* it, it cannot affect general historical Chronology as *included* therein.

These remarks premised, it may be of use to add a brief account of the progress of the principle Cycles adopted from time to time, with a view to harmonize the Lunar and Solar years.

Cleostratus, a Greek philosopher, about B. C. five hundred and thirty-two, discovered the Cycle of eight years, which was used to regulate the period of the celebration of the Olympic games,¹ festivals, &c., as founded upon the direction of their "oracle," as Prideaux says, to observe all their sacrifices and festivals, *Κατατρία*, i. e., *according to three*; which they interpreted to mean years, months, and days; and that the *years* were to be reckoned according to the course of the *Sun*, and the *months* and *days* according to that of the *moon*. Hence their endeavors to bring all these to meet together; i. e., to bring the same months, and all the days of them, to fall as near as possible within the same time of the sun's course, that so the same solemnities might always be celebrated within the same seasons of the year, as well as in the same months, and on the same days of them; the difference

1. Investigator, vol. iv., p. 140.

between the lunar revolutions of the moon, (twelve of which made their common year), in its conjunction with that of the sun in bringing it round to the same point of the ecliptic, being *eleven days*, minus that of the sun.

The first attempt to this end was that of Deiteris, of a Cycle of *two* years, by an intercalation of one month. But this was found to exceed the solar year by seven and a half days. Soon after the discovery of this defect, the Tetræteris was introduced, which was a Cycle of *four* years. But here again was a difference between lunar and solar time, every fourth year, of full fourteen days. To remedy this defect, Cleostratus, as above, intercalated alternately, one four years with *one* month, and the next four years with *two* months, which brought it to the Octoeteris, or Cycle of *eight* years, which was a more perfect Cycle than either of the preceding; leaving, between lunar and solar time, in eight years, a difference of only one day, fourteen hours, and nine minutes. The augmentation of this difference, however, finally originated several other Cycles, of which the learned Prideaux pronounces that of Meto (or Meton) to be the most perfect. This Meto was a famous Athenian astronomer, and flourished about the time of Nehemiah, four hundred and thirty-two years before Christ. He, as the learned author ¹ above named asserts, invented,

1. Shuckford withholds the distinction here ascribed to Meton by Prideaux, as the exclusive originator of this Cycle. Thus it is the greatest and the best of men will differ. His words are,

"As to Meton, from his account of his settling the Equinoxes,

the Enneadecosteris, or the Cycle of *nineteen* years, which is a *lunar* Cycle, called the Cycle of the moon; the numbers whereof being, by reason of the excellency of their use, written in the ancient callendars in golden letters — in our present almanacs is called, *the golden numbers*. This Cycle is made up of nineteen lunar years and seven lunar months, by seven intercalations added to them; each year of the *seven* consisting of thirteen months, and the rest of twelve. In adapting it to the seasons for celebrating the Grecian Olympiads, the use to which it was first applied, as the recurrence of these Olympiads fell on the first full

and from Dean Prideaux's of his nineteen years cycle,^a it would seem probable that he was a very exact astronomer. But I must confess, there appear to me to be considerable reasons against admitting this opinion of him; for how could Meton be so exact an astronomer, when Hipparchus, who lived almost three hundred years after Meton,^b was the first who found out, that the Equinox had a motion backwards, since even he was so far from being accurate, that he miscounted twenty-eight years in one hundred, in calculating that motion.^c Meton might not be so exact an astronomer as he is represented. The cycle which goes under his name might be first projected by him; but perhaps he did not give it that perfection which it afterwards received. Columella lived in the time of one Emperor Claudius, and he might easily ascribe more to Meton than belonged to him, as living so many ages after him. Later authors perfected Meton's rude draughts of astronomy; and Columella might suppose the corrections made in his originals by later hands to be Meton's. We now call the nineteen years cycle by his name, but I suppose, that nothing more of it belongs to him than an original design of something like it, which the astrononers of after ages added to and completed by degrees.

a. Prideaux, Connect. part ii., book iv.

b. Newton's Chronology, p. 94

c. Id. *Ibid.*

moon after the summer solstice, which was observed to be on the twenty-first day of the Egyptian month Phamenoth; this, when reduced to the Julian year coincided with the twenty-seventh of June. ¹

The difference between lunar and solar time at the end of this Cycle being only two hours, one minute, and twenty seconds, the learned Prideaux, as already stated, pronounces the "perfectest," and says, "to a nearer agreement than this *no other Cycle* can bring them." ² Yet, in a subsequent part ³ of his very elaborate and useful work, after adverting to his previous account of the above Cycles, including that of Meto, (to which, it is true, he still gives the preference,) he says of them that "*they all failed,*" &c., and then proceeds to introduce to the notice of the reader another, called the *Calippic Cycle*, as a little *perfecter* than "*the perfectest.*" ⁴ The account which he gives of this Cycle is, in substance, as follows:—

After the expiration of a century, it was found that the Cycle of Meto "had overshot what he aimed at by a quarter of a day." Hence, Calippus, a famous astronomer of Cyzicus, in Mysia, three hundred and thirty years before Christ, invented a Cycle, which consisted of a period of *seventy-six* years, embracing

1. Prid. Con. vol. ii., p. 184 — 188.

2. Ibid, p. 87.

3. Prid. Con. vol. iii., p. 313.

4. What we complain of in the above is, the tendency of such looseness, in the treatment of a subject of this abstruse nature, to produce confusion in the mind of an ordinary reader. One such instance, with many, is quite sufficient to arrest all further inquiry.

precisely *four* of the Metonic Cycles; the effect of which was, to give a difference of only *one day* between the termination of each Calippic and four Metonic Cycles, a period of seventy-six years!

Now, of the two above Cycles, though the learned Dean Prideaux says of the *Metonic*, that it continued to regulate the Grecian Olympiads down to the time when Christianity gained the ascendancy in the Roman Empire; ¹ yet of the *Calippic* Cycle he says, that it "was most in reputation among the Greeks, for the bringing of the reckonings of the sun and moon's motions to an agreement," ² only about one hundred years after the Cycle of Meto, the latter being invented four hundred and thirty-two years before Christ — the former three hundred and thirty years before Christ.

Confidence in these deductions, however, increases with the advances of astronomical science in *after* ages, in the more accurate measurements of solar time. Of these advances, as connected with those which more immediately concern us, it is only necessary that we advert to our account ³ of the Julian and the Julian-Gregorian solar year, as the universally admitted *standard* ⁴ for the measurement of time in chronological science.

One very important question *now* to be decided is,

1. Prid., Con. vol. ii., p. 188.

2. Prid., Con. vol. iii., p. 314.

3. See pp. 40, 41., &c.

4. I here assume the responsibility to add, *since the period of the Flood.*

whether sacred time, *Ante-diluvian* and *Post-diluvian*, agree the one with the other? Our solar year, as is evident from the preceding, amounts to nearly three hundred and sixty-five days and a quarter. But according to Shuckford, it appears, that "*before the Flood, the solar year was three hundred and sixty days;*"¹ that "in that space of time the sun made one entire revolution;" and consequently, that "all the time of the *Ante-diluvian* world, chronology was fixed and easy," &c.

But, have we *scripture evidence* of this fact? We answer affirmatively, and that too of the most unquestionable kind. Moses, in his "computation of the duration of the flood," tells us that it began "on the seventeenth day of the second month;"² prevailed without any sensible abatement for one hundred and fifty days;³ and that the Ark lodged on mount Ararat on the seventeenth day of the seventh month.⁴ So that we see, from the seventeenth of the second month, to the seventeenth of the seventh month, (i. e., for five whole months,) he allows one hundred and fifty days, which is just thirty days to each month, for five times thirty days are a one hundred and fifty."⁵

Now, this computation of the duration of the Flood, we say, must have been regulated by the *Ante-dilu-*

1. Shuck. Con. Vol. i., p. 11.

2. Gen. vii., 11.

3. Gen. vii., 24.

4. Gen. viii., 3, 4.

5. Shuck. Con. Vol. i., p. 11, 12.

vian Standard; and for the simple reason, that no miraculous communication had been made of the *difference* between a solar Ante-diluvian and a solar Post-diluvian year. Nor, considering the state of astronomical science at the time Moses wrote his history, is there any ground for surprise at his omission to recognize this difference, the first attempt to correct the Egyptian year by astronomical observations not having been made till near one hundred and fifty years after his death.

These premises admitted, where, we ask, the propriety of measuring sacred ante-diluvian time by the post-diluvian solar year, the necessary result of which is, the addition thereto (i. e., a period of one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years) of above twenty-three years?

Another question now presents itself, viz.:—Can the sacred or JEWISH year (*lunar*,) historic and prophetic, be made to harmonize with the JULIAN solar year? On the answer to this question depends the merits of all our subsequent deductions,—as, without this harmony, the difference between the Jewish common year at three hundred and sixty days, and that of the Julian solar year at three hundred and sixty-five days and about a quarter, when applied to a given period, will vary in the proportion of one year *plus* the former, to every thirty-two years of the latter. Our position therefore in reference to the above, is as follows,—

As of the *Julian solar* year, so of the *Jewish lunar* year — INTERCALARY TIME was a characteristic pe-

culiar to *both*. Hence the *harmony* of the one with the other.

On this subject however, there is a difference of opinion among the learned, so far at least as relates to the period between the Flood and the captivities. Shuckford, for instance, says, — we do not find that God, by any special appointment, corrected the year for the Jews. — And we do not any where read that Moses ever made a correction of it. And speaking of the Jewish *intercalary* year, he observes that we nowhere in the books of the Old Testament find any mention of such a month; and he quotes Scaliger as being positive, that there was no such intercalary month in the time of Moses, or of the Judges, or of the Kings; and finally, that a year consisted of twelve months in the times of David and Solomon,¹ &c. These declarations to the contrary notwithstanding however, the learned Doctor admits that there *was an actual change* in SOLAR time, Ante-diluvian and Post-diluvian, to the amount of *five days* and almost *six hours*, and that this change took place *at the Flood*; ² also, that as soon as it was observed, philosophers endeavored to set right their chronology by it, inasmuch as the ancient (ante-diluvian solar) measure of a year *would not do*, &c.

According, then, to the above, it is not singular that Moses never corrected the solar year; nor that the in-

1. Comp. 1 Kings iv., 5, with 1 Chron. xxvii. See Shuck. Con. Vol. i., p. 11, 12.

2. Ibid. Vol. i., p. 8.

tercalary year was unknown, not only in his time, but in that also of the Judges and Kings. But what does this argue? Certainly that Divine Providence left the discovery to the province of *artificial* means, respecting which Moses, &c., had not the sagacity to find out!

Now, though it be conceded that there was no Divine revelation given of the changes in the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian year, between the year of the Flood, A. M., 1656, and the mission of Moses, A. M., 2513, an interval of eight hundred and fifty-seven years; — *is it true also as applicable to the time of the Judges and Kings, or even of the entire mission of Moses?* This is a point which merits investigation; and as connected with the subject now under discussion, we remark, it is evident that, in the time of *David*, as recorded in First Chronicles, the twelfth and thirty-second verse, the practice of astronomical observations among the Hebrews, is more than intimated in the words, “and of the children of ISSACHAR, which were men that *had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.*” If there be any doubts as to the import of this passage, so far as we can place reliance upon the readings of the Targum, it is as follows: — “*They (the children of Issachar) were skilful in the knowledge of times, and wise to fix the beginning of the years; dextrous at setting the new moons, and fixing their feasts at their seasons.*”¹ Nor is this all. We are furnished with a nucleus to the

1. J. Bichen, A.M. Signs of the Times, 1808 .Flemings Apocal. Key. Appendix, p. 153.

mode by which they done this. The Divine faithfulness, in lengthening the days of King Hezekiah fifteen years, was confirmed by the miraculous throwing back fo the shadow on the *sun-dial* of Ahaz, ¹ ten degrees. And though it does not appear by *whom*, and *when* this sun-dial was first brought into use : yet, query, with whom so probable as with the astronomical "children of Issachar?" That Tribe, in the numbering of Israel, stands next in order to that of *Judah*.² The insignia of Issachar was that of the "strong ass, crouching down between two burdens."³ Upon their entrance into Canaan, Issachar was one of the six Tribes appointed to stand on Mount Ephraim to *bless* the people ; ⁴ and the princes or Issachar were with Deborah, in her war against Jabin and Sisera."⁵ Now, to this conspicuous Tribe, and to no other, can the learned Prideaux refer, when, speaking of the measurement of Jewish time "while they lived in their own land," he says, they "might easily receive notice of what was *ordained* in this matter *by those who had the care and ordering of it*."⁶ But this carries us back, if not to the time of Moses, yet certainly to that of Joshua, his immediate successor. But if, as Dean Prideaux terms it, the "*inartificial*" mode of reckoning time by the Hebrews, can be shown to have

1. Kings xx., 9. Isa. xxxviii., 8.

3. Gen. xi., 14.

5. Judges iv.; — v., 1, 5.

2. Num. i., 29; ii., 5.

4. Deut. xxvii., 12.

6. Prid. Con: vol. i., p. 98:

commenced in the time of MOSES, it is then evident that the Jewish year, from the period of his mission down to the time of Solomon, could not have been reckoned exclusively by a year of twelve months, each of thirty days.

We deem it, however, indispensable to our subsequent inquiries, that we enter into this matter somewhat in detail: in doing which, in order to fix in the mind what we conceive to be the true nature of Jewish time, and to show its harmony with our Julian solar year, we shall lay down the following rule, viz. :—

“THAT THOUGH THE JEWISH ORDINARY YEAR IS TO BE ATTENDED TO WHEN BUT FEW YEARS ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION; YET, IN A LONG SUCCESSION OF TIME THEY ARE NOT TO BE NOTICED; FOR BY INTERCALATIONS THEY AMOUNT TO THE SAME WITH SOLAR TIME.”¹

I. Of the *post-diluvian sacred year* from the Flood to the mission of Moses, the Hebrews no doubt computed time by the ante-diluvian solar year of three hundred and sixty days. During their bondage in Egypt, they were probably regulated in their mode of reckoning by the Egyptian calendar. “But that the Israelites made use of (either) after their coming out of Egypt can never be made consisting with the Mo-
saical Law.”² For,

1. J. Bicheno, A. M. Signs of the Times. Fleming, appendix, p. 143.

2. Prid. Con. vol. ii., p. 100.

II. At the time of the EXODE, "*the Lord spake unto MOSES and AARON in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the BEGINNING of months: it shall be THE FIRST MONTH OF THE YEAR to you.*"¹ And again, "*And thou shalt number seven Sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years, and the space of the seven Sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month; in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound in all your land; and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a JUBILEE unto you: and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you; ye shall not sow, neither reap, that which groweth of itself in it; neither gather the grapes in it of the vine undressed.*"² These two passages constitute the basis of sacred time, according to the Jewish reckoning. From the *first* is formed their *Ecclesiastical* year, which takes its rise from the observance of the PASSOVER, instituted in the month of *Nisan*, near the time of the *vernal* Equinox. From the *second*, the *Civil* year, or the period of the Jubilee, which restored to every individual Jew his *civil* rights and forfeited possessions, and which was celebrated in the month of *Tisri*, about the time of the *autumnal*

1. Exod., xii., 1, 2.

2. Lev. xxv.; 8 — 11.

Equinox. While, therefore, the former year was used to adjust the observance of their fasts, festivals, and other *ecclesiastical* times and concerns, the latter formed the basis of all their computations in the regulation of their Jubilees and Sabbatical years, and other civil matters, such as contracts, obligations, &c.

The month *Nisan*, in which commenced the Jewish *ecclesiastical* year, is also called *Abib*.¹ The PASSOVER, instituted under Moses in this month, was their *principal festival*, appointed as a *perpetual memento* of their Exode from Egypt. The *time* of its observance was fixed by a *divine command*.² This direction very naturally led to the measurement of time by *months*; in doing which (in the absence of a more perfect knowledge of astronomical science) they could only determine the length of the year by marking the phasis, or appearance of the moon. From one new moon to the other, therefore, they could tell the number of days in each month by the number of days of their *week*.³ Hence, at the appearance of the *new moon* they began their MONTHS. But the course of the moon, i. e., from one new moon to another, consisting of twenty-nine days and a half, to avoid the confusion, otherwise arising from this circumstance, they made their months to consist of twenty-nine and of thirty days, alternately; “and of twelve of these

1. Deut. xvi., 1.

2. Exod. xii., 2; Lev. xxiii., 5; Num. ix., 2—5; xxviii., 16, 17.

3. Exod. xx., 8—11.

months their *common* year consisted." They were as follows :—

| | | | |
|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|
| Nisan, or Abib | 29 days | Tisri, or Ethanim,.. | 29 days |
| Iyar, or Tziv,..... | 30 days | Bul, or Marchesvan, | 30 days |
| Sivan, | 29 days | Cisleu, | 29 days |
| Tamuz, | 30 days | Tebet, | 30 days |
| Ab, | 29 days | Shebat, | 29 days |
| Elul, | 30 days | Adar, | 30 days |

But their ecclesiastical year commencing with Nisan, or Abib, as above, and including these twelve months, made up a *lunar* year of only three hundred and fifty-four days, which, in *one year*, fell *eleven days* short of the *solar* year; in consequence of which, the second *lunar* year commenced earlier than the *solar* by eleven days; and this, "in *thirty-three* years time, would carry back the beginning of the year (lunar) through all the four seasons to the same point again, and get a *whole year* from the *solar* reckoning." Hence, independently of some medium to *harmonize* lunar and solar time, it were impossible to adhere to the Divine command as to the *time* of observing the Passover.

To remedy this defect, the Hebrews had recourse to the following expedient. Their Paschal Festival, "the first day of which was always fixed to the middle of their month Nisan;"¹ their Pentecost fifty days after;² and their feast of Tabernacles, on the fifteenth of Tisri,

1. Exod. xii., 3—20; Lev. xxiii., 4—8; Num. xxviii., 16, 17.

2. Lev. xxiii., 15—17; Deut. xvi., 9.

six months after ; ¹ as the first required the eating of the Paschal Lamb, and the offering up of the wave-sheaf, as the *first-fruits* of their *barley harvest* — the second, the offering of the two wave-loaves, as the *first-fruits* of their *wheat harvest* — and the third, being the time fixed for the ingathering of all the fruits of the earth, “the Passover could not be observed till the *lambs* were grown fit to be eaten, and the *barley* fit to be *reaped* ; nor the Pentecost, till the *wheat* was ripe ; nor the feast of the Tabernacles, till the ingatherings of the *vine-yard* and *olive-yard* were over.” Hence the necessity of INTERCALATING their lunar year, which was done in the following manner : “ Whenever, according to the course of the common year, the fifteenth day of Nisan happened to fall *before* the day of their *vernal* equinox, then they *intercalated* a month, and then the Paschal solemnity was thereby carried one month farther into the year, and all the other festivals with it. This intercalary month, being added at the end of the year, after the last month, Adar, they called *Veadar*, or the second Adar, which made that year consist of *thirteen* months, or three hundred and eighty-four days. This intercalation either took place on the second or third year, as the case might be, and formed the Jewish *leap* year, from the institution of the Passover under Moses, down to the time of the Captivities.

We deem it incontrovertible, therefore, that, according to the Mosaical law, as their year during the last named period, was made up of months purely *lunar*, it

1. Lev. xxiii., 34 — 39.

could in no other way be made to harmonize with solar time than by an intercalary month. Not, however, that it is pretended that their months can be fixed to any certain *day* in the Julian calendar, they falling always within the compass of thirty days, sooner or later therein, as will appear from the following : —

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1. Nisan, | { <i>March.</i> <i>April.</i> | 7. Tizri, | { <i>September.</i> <i>October.</i> |
| 2. Iyar, | { <i>April.</i> <i>May.</i> | 8. Marchesvan, | { <i>October.</i> <i>November.</i> |
| 3. Sivan, | { <i>May.</i> <i>June.</i> | 9. Cisleu, | { <i>November.</i> <i>December.</i> |
| 4. Tamuz, | { <i>June.</i> <i>July.</i> | 10. Tebet, | { <i>December.</i> <i>January.</i> |
| 5. Ab, | { <i>July.</i> <i>August.</i> | 11. Shebat, | { <i>January.</i> <i>February.</i> |
| 6. Elul, | { <i>August.</i> <i>September.</i> | 12. Adar, | { <i>February.</i> <i>March.</i> |

III. After the captivities, and when the Jews became dispersed through all nations, they were forced to make use of Cycles and astronomical calculations for the fixing of their new moons and intercalations, and the times of their feasts, fasts, and other observances, that so they might be everywhere uniform herein. The first Cycle they made use of for this purpose¹ was that of eighty-four years : by this they fixed their Paschal feast, and by that their whole year besides ; and the use hereof the primitive Christians borrowed from them, and for some of the first centuries, fixed their Easter in every year according to it : but this, after some time, being

1. Vide Bucherium de antiquo Paschali Judæorum Cyclo.

found to be faulty, Meto's Cycle of nineteen years¹ was, after the council of Nice, brought into use by them for this purpose instead of the other; and the Jews, following their example herein, almost about the same time, came into the same usage also; and on this Cycle is founded the present form of their year. The first who began to work it into this shape,² was Rabbi Samuel, rector of the Jewish school at Sora, in Mesopotamia: Rabbi Adda, who was a great astronomer, pursued his scheme; and after him, Rabbi Hillel, about A. D. 360, brought it to that perfection in which it now is; and being Nasi, or prince of their sanhedrim, he gave it the authority of his sanction, and by virtue thereof it hath ever since been observed by them, and they say always is to be observed to the coming of the Messiah. According to this form³ there are, within the compass of the said nineteen years Cycle, seven intercalated years, consisting of thirteen months, and twelve common years, consisting of twelve months. The intercalated years are the third, the sixth, the eighth, the eleventh, the fourteenth, the seventeenth, and the

1. Epistola Ambrosii 83 ad episcopos per Æmiliam constitutos. It was by the council of Nice referred to the church of Alexandria, every year to fix the time of Easter, and they did it by Meto's Cycle of nineteen years.

2. Juchasin; Shalsheth Haccabala; & Zemach David, & ex iisdem Morinus in exercitat. Prima in Pentateuchum Samaritanum, cap. 3.

3. Talmud in Rosh Hasshanah. Maimonides in Kiddush Hachodesh, & Seldenus de Anno Civili veterum Judæorum.

*nineteenth of that Cycle ; and when one round of this Cycle is over, they begin another ; and so constantly, according to it, fix their new moons (at which all their months begin) and all their fasts and feasts in every year. And this form of their year, it must be acknowledged, is very exactly and astronomically contrived, and may truly be reckoned the greatest piece of art and ingenuity that is to be found among that people."*¹ And, "since the Jewish calendar hath been fixed by Rabbi Hillel, upon *the certain foundations of astronomy*, tables may indeed be made, which may point out to what day in that calendar every day in the JULIAN YEAR shall answer ;" and the same rule, if applied to the time which *preceded* A. D. 360, regulates the otherwise inaccurate intercalary time of the Jewish reckoning, as arising both from the inartificial mode of their intercalations, by the phasis and appearance of the moon, or by their Cycle of eighty-four years.

But, as of the Jewish ecclesiastical, so of their *civil* year. Their Jubilees, which were celebrated every fiftieth year, were periods of seven sabbaths of years complete, with an independent year *added* on, completing half a century, when seven sabbaths were numbered again, and so on ; the following account of which we have in the book of Leviticus : Says the Lord to Moses, "a Jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you — ye shall not sow. In the year of this Jubilee ye shall return, every man unto his possession."²

1. Prieaux, vol. i., pp. 98, 99.

2. Lev. xxv., 19 — 13.

Now, it is plain from the following, viz. :— “ When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a Sabbath unto the Lord : *six years* shalt thou sow thy fields, but in the *seventh* shall be a sabbath of rest unto the Lord, &c.,”¹ that the direction for counting the seven sabbatical years that *precede* the Jubilee is the same as that of the single sabbatical year — one command serves for all. Nor are we left to conjecture as to whether the *first* sabbatical year of the series begins with a *Jubilee* ; that being directly contrary to the Divine command, which prohibits all *sowing* and *reaping* on that year.² Nor is it at all necessary to the completion of the fifty years Jubilee, that the first in the series should be a *Jubilee*. This is evident from its analogy with the feast of Pentecost, for the calculating of which the following direction was given :— “ And ye shall count unto you from the *morrow after* the sabbath, &c., seven sabbaths shall be *complete*, even unto the *morrow after the seventh sabbath* shall ye number *fifty* days.”³ “ Now from the morrow after the first sabbath, to the morrow after the seventh sabbath, both inclusive, are fifty days, independent of the *sabbath* from which the period is really dated ; but from which it is carefully separated in the direction for the mode of reckoning.”⁴

On the subject of Jubilees, “ Dr. Prideaux both makes the Jubilee the fiftieth year, and allows also six years of sowing to each septenary, without mutilating

1. Lev. xxv., 3, 4.

3. Lev. xxiii., 15.

2. Lev. xxv., 11—13.

4. Investigator, vol. iv., p. 124.

any one series. He also makes the Jubilee to be the fiftieth year every time it revolves." ¹ The learned Doctor "rejects the Jubilee years, together with the sabbatical years, from his chronological system;" ² but of those who adopt it, to the exclusion of an intercalary year, he says, "it is *indeed the truth of the matter*, and I know no objection against it, but that it *exposeth the error* of those, who, thinking that the sabbatical years did always happen each exactly on the seventh year after the former, have in that order and series *placed them in their chronological computations*; without considering, that after every forty-ninth year, a jubilee year did *intervene* between the Shemittah that then ended, and the beginning of the next that followed." ³ To this may be added the fact, that "many learned men on the Continent inclined to this opinion so late as the middle of the last century, as may be seen from the following words of *Michaelis*: "if those are right who place the Jubilee in the fiftieth year, there must *every half century* have been two years of rest in immediate succession. For the forty-ninth was a seventh year, and of course a year of rest; and in the fiftieth year the land was in like manner to keep holiday. And however paradoxical this may seem, it does appear to be the meaning of the *Mosaic* statute." ⁴

Of the application of *Jubilees* in chronological com-

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid. p. 131.

3. Investigator, vol. iv., p. 131.

4. Investigator, vol. iv., p. 131. Com. on Law of Moses, vol. i., p. 388.

putations, we shall have occasion to speak in the sequel.

Finally, on the subject of the Jewish mode of reckoning time as above set forth, we remark, that, whether, during their sojourn in their own land, or under the kings, captivities, &c., we think we have demonstrated the correctness of the Rule, "*that though the Jewish ordinary year is to be attended to when but few years are under consideration, yet, in a long succession of time, they are not to be noticed, for by Intercalations, they amount to the same with solar time.*" It only remains therefore that we apply the same process to the aggregate of years from the deluge to the present year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and forty-two, in *sacred* chronological computations, Historic and Prophetic, as that adopted in the regulation of our *vulgar* Era. The references of the learned Shuckford to 1 kings iv., 5, compared with 1 Chron. xxvii., 15, as evidence that in the time of the kings, sacred time, whether embracing one or five hundred years, was computed at three hundred and sixty days each, can never be reconciled with their use of *intercalations*, which we have shown in one form or other to have been coeval with the time of Moses. The precedent for computing time according to the *Ante-diluvian* solar year, as predicated of the Mosaic account of the continuance of the waters of the Flood upon the Earth, Genesis vii., 11, viii., 4, vii., 24, seems to have furnished sufficient grounds for its subsequent use on all *ordinary* occasions, for the obvious reason that it approximated nearer on the one

hand to *post-diluvian* solar time than the Jewish Lunar year; and on the other, furnished greater facilities for the computation of smaller periods, as 1 Chron. xxvii., 15. And, if applicable in this respect to the time of the kings, then also of the *Prophets*. Hence their adoption, in their prophetic numbers, (all of which were computed by *days*,) of the above year. But these prophetic numbers, counting, as they do, "*each day* for a *year*," and extending as they do, to "the end of all things," must necessarily be interpreted by the intercalary and cyclical computations, common, as well to the historic and prophetic records of the *Jews* from the time of Moses, as to the Gentiles.

These premises admitted, and it follows, that SACRED time, Historic and Prophetic, is the same. Also, that sacred time, by intercalations, account to the same as SOLAR time.

To return now to that GOLDEN CHAIN OF MEASUREMENT of the entire sabbatical day of God's rest of which we have already spoken, and to which the preceding disquisition respecting the Criteria of measuring time Jewish and Julian is introductory, we proceed without further delay to remark, that, for the chronological data of the *first part* of this chain, we shall rely upon the *Historical Records* of the Old Testament. It will also serve our present convenience, to divide it into the following periods.

I. The first, extends from the creation and fall, to the Deluge.

II. The second, from the Deluge, to the call of Abraham.

III. The third, from the call of Abraham, to the Exodus.

IV. The fourth, from the Exodus, to the end of the reign of Saul.

V. The fifth, from the death of Saul to the commencement of the Babylonish Captivity.

VI. The sixth, the Captivity.

VII. The interval, between the end of the Captivity, and the commencement of the seventy prophetic weeks of Daniel.

At this point, viz., the commencement of the seventy prophetic weeks of David, begins the designation of Time, reaching thence to the End of the world, by the great prophetic Chronometer, of which IT forms the basis; and which, taken in connexion with Daniel's visions of the Image of gold, silver, brass, iron and clay; (Dan. ii;) of the vision of the four beasts, &c., rising up out of the Sea; (Dan. vii;) and of the vision of the Ram and the He-Goat, &c., (Dan. viii;) constitute, as the celebrated Mede expresses it, "the SACRED KALENDAR AND GREAT ALMANACK OF PROPHECY." ¹

Let us, first, however, pass through the several periods above named, down to the point where it commences its measurement by prophecy, as beginning with the seventy prophetic weeks of Daniel.

Of the extraordinary discrepancies of scriptural Chronologists, in this department, we have already spoken.²

1. Mede's Apos. of the latter times, ch. xii.

2. See p. 153.

These discrepancies however, may be traced to predilections in favor of one rather than another, of the various sources of information on this subject.

"If we pass, however, from the Chronologies, whether Jewish or Grecian, Arabic or Christian, to the *only true and original sources* of the world's early Chronology, we find the question narrowed. These are, the Genealogies of the Patriarch's, antediluvian and post-diluvian, as given in the Book of Genesis, and the subsequent Chronological notices of the Judges and kings of Israel." We have already assigned the reason for adopting the Chronology of the Hebrew text in preference to any other.¹ And, "were the Chronology thence deducible *continuous*, and the authority of the Hebrew text in them *undoubted*, the date of the creation and outline of early Chronology would be settled. But this is not the case. There are *two breaks* in the Chronology of the period between *Moses* and *Saul*; and on the numbers in the Patriarchal genealogies there is a remarkable discrepancy in the Hebrew text, the Samaritan, and that of the Septuagint translation."² The tables which follow, will serve to exhibit this discrepancy, which we deem it of importance to examine, in order to a more satisfactory evidence of the entire superiority of the Hebrew text.

"It is," however, "to be remembered that the Septuagint was a Greek translation from the Hebrew, made B. C. 240, and having been soon

1. See p. 116—119.

2. Investigator, vol. iv., p. 334.

received as of authority by the Jews dispersed over the countries of the Mediterranean, quoted by the Evangelists, and revered by the early Christian fathers, almost beyond the Hebrew text itself, it must ever be regarded on doubtful points as an authority of no mean weight. There are added in the fourth column the numbers as given by the famous historian Josephus, in his "Jewish antiquities," and which he translated, he tells us, (this was about 94, A. D.) faithfully from the original."

Antediluvian Patriarchs.

| | Heb. | Sam. | Sept. | Josephus. |
|----------------------------|------|------|-------|-----------|
| 1. <i>Adam</i> | 130 | 130 | 230 | 230 |
| 2. <i>Seth</i> | 105 | 105 | 205 | 205 |
| 3. <i>Enos</i> | 90 | 90 | 190 | 190 |
| 4. <i>Cainan</i> | 70 | 70 | 170 | 170 |
| 5. <i>Mahalaleel</i> | 65 | 65 | 165 | 165 |
| 6. <i>Jared</i> | 162 | 62 | 162 | 162 |
| 7. <i>Enoch</i> | 65 | 65 | 165 | (1)65* |
| 8. <i>Methuselah</i> | 187 | 67 | 187 | 187 |
| 9. <i>Lamech</i> | 182 | 53 | 188 | 182 |
| 10. <i>Noah</i> | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 |
| | 0656 | 1307 | 2262 | 2256 |

* 165 is doubtless the correct reading.

"It is important to observe that the variations in this table are evidently not the effect of *accident*, but *design*; because the years before the son's birth and the residues agree in all the cases with the totals of *lives*;—with this exception, that in the Samaritan, the residues in the 5th, 7th, and 9th, are *shortened*, to adapt them to the shorter period between JARED and the FLOOD."

Thus, in the Heb. and Samaritan *Adam* has $130+800=930$ } years.
 In the Sept. and Josephus. $230+700=930$ }
 Again, in the Heb. and Samar., *Seth* has $105+807=912$ } years.
 In the Sept. and Josephus $205+707=912$ }

"On the whole, in *this* table the question will lie between 1656 years, the computation in the *Hebrew*, and 2256, that in *Josephus*." With the *latter*, the *Septuagint* agrees in every point, but in having 188 instead of 182 in the case of *LAMECH*; and here the *Heb.* supports *Josephus*: with the Heb. the *Samaritan* agrees in seven cases out of the ten; and where it differs, Josephus and the Septuagint are with the Hebrew."

In the table of the *Post-diluvian Patriarchs* the case is different. Here the Samaritan, Septuagint, and Josephus, all agree in the longer computation.

Post-diluvian Patriarchs.

| | Heb. | Samar. | Josephus. | Sept't |
|------------------------------------------------|------|--------|-----------|--------|
| 11. <i>Shem</i> , (aged 100 at the flood)..... | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| 12. <i>Arphaxad</i> | 35 | 135 | 135 | 135 |
| <i>Cainan</i> , (spurious.) | — | — | (130) | — |
| 13. <i>Salah</i> | 30 | 130 | 130 | 130 |
| 14. <i>Heber</i> | 34 | 134 | 134 | 134 |
| 15. <i>Peleg</i> | 30 | 130 | 130 | 130 |
| 16. <i>Reu</i> | 32 | 132 | 132 | 130 |
| 17. <i>Serug</i> | 30 | 130 | 130 | 132 |
| 18. <i>Nahor</i> | 29 | 79 | 79 | 120 |
| 19. <i>Terah</i> *..... | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 |
| 20 to <i>Abraham</i> | 352 | 1002 | 1002 | 1053 |

* Abraham's birth is usually placed at the 70th year of Terah, on the supposition of his having been Terah's *eldest* son. But the nar-

"Here the choice will lie between the 352 years of the *Heb.*, and the 1002 of the Samaritan and *corrected* Septuagint copies :"—corrected by the rejection of the second Cainan as a *spurious* generation. For as the Septuagint itself omits this in its repetition of the genealogies 1 Chron. i., 24 ; and in Gen. xi., 12, not only the Heb. and Samaritan copies omit it, but *Jōsephus* also, and all the ancient *versions* and *Targums* without exception ; the most judicious chronologers whether adopting the *Hebrew* chronology or the *Septuagint*, agree, for the most part, in *rejecting* it.

Now, then, the question of the comparative credibility of the numbers, as given in the *Greek* and *Jōsephus*, or in the *Hebrew*, the evidence to be considered is threefold : comprehending—1. The authority of the respective MSS.—2. The evidence from the nature of things treated of,—and 3. Supposing wilful adulterations of the text to have taken place on one or the other side, (of which there can be no doubt,) the evidence as to any probable inducements with one, rather than with the other, to make the alteration.

I. *The direct evidence of MSS.*, may be considered as preponderating in favor of the *Hebrew*, in the Table of the *ante-diluvian* patriarchs, the Samaritan generally agreeing with it ;—in that of the *post-diluv-*

native of Moses, as Usher has shown, determines his birth to the 130th year of Terah. For, comparing Gen. xi. 32, and xii. 4, it appears that on Terah's death, at the age of 205, Abram, who then left Haran, was 75 years old. *Haran* appears to have been Terah's *eldest* son.

ian it may rather be considered as in favor of *Josephus* and the *Septuagint*,—the *Samaritan* agrees more nearly with them. There is, however, this important circumstance in favor of the *Hebrew*, that the *Samaritan*, adding the *totals* as well as the *residues*, (which the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint* do not,) these totals do, with two exceptions, accord with the *Hebrew* computation, not with that of the *Septuagint*. This disagreement indicates error and tampering with the passage, either in the *Septuagint* or the *Samaritan*; and consequently diminishes the evidence derivable from their agreement in favor of those numbers in the *first* column in which they agree.*

| | Hebrew. | | | Samaritan. | | | Septuagint. | | |
|------------|---------|------|--------|------------|------|--------|-------------|------|--------|
| | Age. | Res. | Total. | Age. | Res. | Total. | Age. | Res. | Total. |
| Shem ... | 102 | 500 | 602 | 102 | 500 | 600† | 102 | 500 | 602 |
| Arphaxad | 35 | 403 | 438 | 135 | 303 | 438 | 135 | 403 | 538 |
| Salah | 30 | 403 | 433 | 130 | 303 | 433 | 130 | 303 | 460 |
| Heber.... | 34 | 430 | 464 | 134 | 270 | 404 | 134 | 270 | 404 |
| Peleg | 30 | 209 | 239 | 130 | 109 | 239 | 130 | 209 | 339 |
| Rue..... | 32 | 207 | 239 | 132 | 107 | 239 | 132 | 207 | 339 |
| Semg.... | 30 | 200 | 230 | 130 | 100 | 230 | 139 | 200 | 330 |
| Nahor.... | 29 | 119 | 148 | 79 | 69 | 148 | 79 | 129 | 208 |
| T'eah.... | 70 | — | 205 | 70* | — | 145 | 70* | — | 205 |

* i. e., to the birth of his eldest son.

† It should be 602.

On the whole, there being on this head of evidence nothing sufficiently conclusive, increasing importance attaches to—

* The Rev. Jos. Wolf informs me—"In the ancient MSS which I saw at Bokhara the chronological notices of the length of the lives both of the *Ante-diluvian* and *Post-diluvian* patriarchs were exactly according to the received *HEBREW* text, though the letters of the MSS resembled the *Samaritan*."

II. The *second* head of evidence, viz, *that from the nature of the things treated of*. This is of a kind within the reach of every understanding; and it is on this that Mr. Clinton has argued conclusively, as it appears to me, in favor of the *Hebrew*.

AGAINST the *Hebrew*, Hales and Jackson had raised the following arguments; 1. that the age of puberty (of the *παιδογονία*) may be considered as beginning after the lapse of *one third* part of life; and consequently, that, when the average length of life was from 400 to 200 years, it was contrary to the course of nature for a man to have a son so early as 32 years of age, the average age according to the *Hebrew*, from: ARPHAXAD to TERAH. 2. That the *short* HEBREW computation is *inconsistent* with our accounts of the *populousness* of the earth at the time of Abraham; — as also 3. with the prevalence of *idolatry* in Abraham's country before his call; — *Noah, Shem, &c.*, being by the computation, *still living*.

The answer is, as to the *first*; the age of puberty begins *now* much *earlier* than after the passing of a *third part* of life: and what it is now, that we have *Scripture* evidence to prove that it *was* when the longevity of man was much greater. For instance, Judah at 48 was a great-grandfather. Benjamin at 30 had 11 sons. Between *Ephraim* and *Joshua* there were 10 generations and 180 years; which gives 20 years on an average to a generation.

This being the case, — the *παιδογονία* beginning *then* at about the same age as now, and continuing

much longer, *the rapid increase of the population*, which the HEBREW copy supposes, between the *flood* and *Abraham*, is really accounted for. "In the present state of mankind it is calculated that the numbers of a people, under favorable circumstances, may be doubled in 10 years. It has been proved by other calculations, that the numbers have actually doubled in periods of 12 and four-fifth years, for *short* periods. In parts of North-America it is acknowledged that the people there doubled their numbers in 15 years. The *Israelites* in Egypt doubled their numbers in periods of something less than fifteen years. Now the first families after the flood were placed in circumstances more favorable to *rapid* increase, than in any *other* period of mankind. They were not gradually emerging from barbarism, but possessed all the arts and civilization of the Ante-diluvian world. They had unoccupied land before them, and their lives were extended to 500, 400, and 200 years. If we assume then, that the population doubled itself in periods of 12 years, the population of the earth, beginning from six parents, would at 226 years arrive at more than 50,000,000 of persons, and in 300 years would amount to 200,000,000. If we take only the actual rate of increase which we know to have occurred in Egypt, and suppose fifteen years to be the period of doubling, still the numbers of mankind would attain 50,000,000 in 345 years, and would reach 200,000,000 in 373 years from the *flood*. I think the former calculation the most probable; but, even in the

latter case, the number of mankind would have reached 200,000,000 in the 24th year of *Abraham*.

“The circumstances of the *dispersion of mankind* are in favor of the *shorter* computation of the *Hebrew* copy. The dispersion was effected by the immediate interposition of providence in opposition to the inclinations of mankind, who desired to dwell *together*, and were averse to the dispersion. Their object was to remain collected in one city. They built the Tower “lest they should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” It is manifest then, that the dispersion was commanded while they were yet *few* in number. It was directed *prospectively*, with a view to prevent the evils that would arise from crowded numbers in a limited space. But at the time assigned to this event by the *longer* dates, more than 500 years after the flood, it was evident this was no longer the condition of mankind. For since, (as we have shown) their numbers would increase in the common progress of things to many millions, their dispersion would then have been no longer a matter of choice, but of necessity. It could not have proceeded from a divine command providing against a future evil, but would have been forced upon them by the actual presence of that evil. The dispersion then in the days of PELEG took effect at an *earlier* period, while the number of mankind was yet a few thousands; and Peleg was born where the *Hebrew* text places him, 101 years after the FLOOD. It is not likely that the numbers of mankind when they

received the command to separate, and prepared to inhabit one city, would exceed 50,000 persons; and this number thus certainly would have reached within 160 years of the flood.

“As to the *third* objection, it is not wonderful that *idolatry* should have sprung up during the lives of *Noah*, and *Shem*, when we consider the multitudes of mankind, and that after the dispersion they were widely scattered over the face of the earth. We know that the Israelites fell into idolatry even in the presence of the *holy mountain*, during the *life-time* of *MOSES*, and afterwards in the midst of the warning of the prophets. The influence of *Arphaxad*, and *Salah*, and *Heber* in Chaldea, would not be greater than that of Moses and Elijah over the children of Israel. Besides, it is not affirmed in Scripture, that all the patriarchs between *Arphaxad* and *Terah* were HOLY men, and never deviated into idolatry.

III. As to *motives* for the adulterations of the true numbers, — “Jackson allows, that though the reasons are plain which induced the Jews of the second century to corrupt the prophecies relating to Christ, their reason for *shortening* the patriarchal genealogies is not so plain. — On the other hand, the first translators of the *Hebrew* Scriptures into Greek, had an obvious motive for *enlarging* the Chronology. The Chaldeans and Egyptians (whose histories were about this time published by *Berosus* and *Manetho*) had claim to a remote antiquity. Hence the translator of the Pentateuch might be led to augment the amount of

the generations by the *centenary additions*, and by the interpolation (as Hales himself allows that it is,) of the second Cainan, in order to carry back the epochs of the *Creation* and the *Flood* to a period more conformable to the high pretensions of the Egyptians and Chaldeans."

On the whole Mr. Clinton concludes, that the **HEBREW** computation of the genealogies may be safely received.

The following important observation may be here added. "They who with Clavier imagine themselves at liberty to *enlarge* the period between the **FLOOD** and **ABRAHAM** to an *indefinite amount*, mistake the question. The uncertainty is not an uncertainty for want of *testimony*, like that which occurs in the early Chronology of Greece, &c.; where the times are uncertain because *no* evidence was preserved, and an approximation of the truth is to be made by a comparison of different particulars. The uncertainty here is of a peculiar character, belonging to this *particular* case. The evidence exists, but in a double form; and we have to decide which is the authentic and genuine copy. But if the *one* is *rejected*, the *other* is *established*. Either the space *before* the Flood was 1656 years, or 2256. Either the period *from* the flood was 1002 years to the call of Abraham, or 352. These periods could not be *greater* than the greatest of them, and it could not be *less* than the least." — The conclusion is, that the *Hebrew* is **CORRECT** in *both*; that *from* the **CREATION** to the **FLOOD**

was 1656 years, from the FLOOD to the CALL 427 years.*

I. In the confidence, therefore, that we have now placed the authority of the Hebrew text as our guide in the matter of chronology beyond all reasonable doubt, we pass at once to the following table of the first period as above, from the creation and fall, to the flood.

| CREATION. A .M. I. | Yrs; | Mo. | D: | A. M. | References: |
|----------------------------|------|-----|----|-------|------------------|
| 1. <i>Adam</i> | 130 | .. | .. | | Gen. v., 3. |
| 2. <i>Seth</i> | 105 | .. | .. | | " " 6. |
| 3. <i>Enos</i> | 90 | .. | .. | | " " 9. |
| 4. <i>Cainan</i> | 70 | .. | .. | | " " 12. |
| 5. <i>Mahalaleel</i> | 65 | .. | .. | | " " 15. |
| 6. <i>Jared</i> | 162 | .. | .. | | " " 18. |
| 7. <i>Enoch</i> | 65 | .. | .. | | " " 21. |
| 8. <i>Methuselah</i> | 187 | .. | .. | | " " 25. |
| 9. <i>Lamech</i> | 182 | .. | .. | | " " 28. |
| 10. <i>Noah</i> | 600 | 1 | 27 | 1656 | " viii., 13, 14. |
| Total, | 1656 | — | — | — | |

II. From the deluge to the vocation of Abraham, the chronology is continuous through the line of the Patriarchs from Noah, thus :

* The preceding, from page 195 is taken from a brief outline of Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, in his "Appendix on the early Scripture Chronology," by an able correspondent of the Investigator Vol. iv., pp. 334—339.

| | Yrs. | Mo. | D. | A. M. | References. |
|-------------------|------|-----|----|-------|---------------|
| 11. Shem..... | 2 | .. | .. | | Gen. xi., 10. |
| 12. Arphaxad..... | 35 | .. | .. | | " " 12. |
| 13. Salah..... | 30 | .. | .. | | " " 14. |
| 14. Eber..... | 34 | .. | .. | | " " 16. |
| 15. Peleg..... | 30 | .. | .. | | " " 18. |
| 16. Ren..... | 32 | .. | .. | | " " 20. |
| 17. Serug..... | 30 | .. | .. | | " " 22. |
| 18. Nahor..... | 29 | .. | .. | | " " 24. |
| 19. Terah..... | 205 | .. | .. | 2083 | " " 32. |
| | 427 | | | | |

III. Of the period (viz., 430 years) from the call of Abraham to the Exodus,¹ several questions have arisen as to the *time of its commencement*. Is it to be dated from the supposed first call of Abraham, while yet in Ur of the Chaldees? or at the death of Terah? or from the time of Joseph's entrance into Egypt? Respecting the last of these, so far as our recollection serves us there is not the least Scriptural foundation. Of the other two, the point to be determined is, whether there was an interval of *five* years between the *first* and the second *call*. To our mind, there is no evidence of any such interval. There is positive scriptural evidence that Abraham was *seventy-five* years old when he left Haran,² at the death of his father, in his 205th year.³ But this makes Terah at the birth of Abraham 130 years old; whereas Gen. xi., 26, expressly declares him to have been but 70 years of age at the birth of the eldest of his three sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haran. The objections, however, which these

1. Exod. xii., 40, 41; Gal. iii., 17.

2. Gen. xii. 4.

3. Gen. xi. 32.

facts involve, are, that it makes Abram the *youngest* son of Terah, which seems to contradict Gen. xi. 26 ; and also gives Terah 60 years for the period of the birth of his three sons. But to these we reply, first,—that there should be an average of 20 years between the birth of each son, by no means invalidates the history—and Second. that Abram *was* the youngest son of Terah, appears evident from Gen. xi. 29, which makes *Haran* the eldest son, his brother Nahor having married his daughter Milcah. Further—Abram married his half-sister, ¹ and, for aught that appears to the contrary, Terah might have lived a considerable period in an unmarried state. True, this would make Sarah older than Abram. But a comparison of Gen. xviii. 11, with Chapters xi., 30, xxi., 9, 10, and Gal. iv., 21—31, seems more than to intimate that God had a special design in all this arrangement.

Now, to the point at issue. The family of Terah as thus constituted, (with the exception of Haran, who died in Ur of the Chaldees,²) left their native country for Canaan ; ³ which removal was induced by the appearance of God to Abram. “Now the Lord *had said* unto Abraham, get thee out of thy country,” ⁴ &c. The family, however, advanced no farther towards Canaan than *Haran*, or Charran, which is in the North-East part of Mesopotamia. How long an interval elapsed between God’s command to Abraham and the family removal to Haran, does not appear ;

1. Gen. xx., 11, 12.
3. Gen. xi., 31.

2. Gen. xi., 28.
4. Gen. xii., 1.

but St. Stephen explicitly states, that it was "*before* he dwelt in Charran."¹ It would seem therefore that the plain face of the sacred narrative would justify the conjecture, that the infirmities of age, &c., induced Terah to stop at Haran, where he died. And though "the country is barren and uninviting,"² parts of the family still remained there.³ This however was incompatible with the divine purpose in reference to Abram. And, immediately upon Terah's death, Abram is reminded of what God "*had said* unto him," in virtue of which, and not, as I understand it, of any *new call* as distinct from the first, he "*departed as the Lord had spoken* unto him; and Lot went with him: And Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran."⁴ If to this it be objected, that "the souls" spoken of as being "gotten" by Abram &c., in Haran, implies their residence at that place for a number of years, it will remain for the objector to prove that the phrase gotten, means *be-gotten*, or born.⁵ These premises admitted, the conclusion is, that the appearance of God to Abram in Ur of the Chaldees, whether at his 70th or 75th year, (we believe it to have been in the latter) his leaving Haran to penetrate into the more southerly parts of Canaan in obedience to the divine command, and the removal of his fathers family to Haran, together with Terah's death, all occurred *within* Abram's 75th year.

1. Acts vii., 2.

2. Alexander's Geog. of the Bible.

3. Gen. xxvii., 43; xxix., 4, 5.

4. Gen. xii., 4.

5. See Gen. xii., 5, with which compare Chap. xi., 31; xiv., 14.

It remains now to reconcile St. Stephen's statement of the term of bondage of the Israelites, which he fixes at 400 years,¹ with the statement of Exodus xii. 40, 41, which makes it 430 years: In order to which, it is only necessary to distinguish between their *affliction* and their *bondage*. The former includes the latter, but is not confined to it. "Their *actual bondage* in Egypt was of comparatively *short* duration: but the *affliction* of the seed of Abraham commenced in his son *Isaac*. The interval between Isaac's birth and the Exodus, was 405 years; and if we suppose the predicted affliction of the seed to commence in Isaac's fifth year, when he would be beginning to feel the effects of Ishmael's mockery,² we then have the *affliction* enduring 400 years, and including in the *last period* of it, the *bondage*." What is said (Exod. xii., 40, 41) "about the *sojourning* of the people for 430 years before the Exodus, presents no difficulty in the way of this solution, but rather confirms it; because it is evident from Gal. iii., 17, that this period" of 430 years is to be reckoned from "Abraham's leaving Haran in Mesopotamia to go to Canaan," which was done 25 years before the birth of Isaac. "This corresponds exactly; and so the whole period of *sojourn* included the other two, which are more accurately characterized as first a period of affliction, and then a period of actual slavery."³ Finally, with this agrees, according to Clarke, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and

1. Acts vii., 6. Gen. xv., 13.

2. Gen. xxi., 9, 10.

3. Mc. Neil's Pros. of the Jews, p. 34.

Septuagint, in both of which Exodus xii., 40, reads as follows:—“Now the sojourning of the children of Israel and their fathers which they sojourned *in the land of Canaan* and *in the land of Egypt*, was 430 years;” i. e., from Abram’s leaving Haran at the death of Terah to the Exodus.

IV. The Fourth period extends from the Exodus to the end of the reign of Saul. It is in this period that the *two breaks* already adverted to, occur; the *first* between the death of Moses and the time of the Judges; the *second* between Eli and Saul.

Then also, in addition to the above, there is a very remarkable discrepancy between the chronology relating to this period as given in 1 Kings vi., 1, and Acts xiii., 17—22, as will appear from what follows:—

1. Both passages commence with the *Exode*.
2. 1 Kings vi., 1, carries the events narrated *beyond* Acts xiii., 17—22. But,
3. The dates of Acts xiii., 17—22, exceed the *whole number of years* of 1 Kings vi., 1, by at least 100 years. Hence,
4. If the dates given in the *other parts* of the sacred narrative decide in favor of Acts xiii., 17—22, the chronology of 1 Kings vi., 1, must be an *error*.

To place this matter, therefore, in the clearest possible light, we remark,

1. That 1 Kings vi., 1, gives an interval of only 480 years between the *Exode* and the commencement of the *building of the Temple* by Solomon.

2. But the *specified dates* given in Acts xiii., 17 — 22, and which *end* with the death of *Saul*, amount to 530 years, which *alone* makes an excess over 1 Kings vi., 1 of 50 years. Then, in *addition*, there are the *two breaks* above named, to which St. Paul affixes no specific dates.

Now, of these two breaks, the first, *between the death of Moses and the time of the Judges*, embraces the following events, as recorded in the Book of Judges, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd chapters, to the 8th verse inclusive, viz.: The *dividing* of the conquered land by lot; the death of all the Judges who *overlived* Joshua; the gathering of *that generation* to their fathers, and the rising up of *another* that knew not the Lord; their conquering the remnant of the nations *left* by Joshua, and their final *servitude* under Cushan Rishathaim, consequent upon their *intermarriages* with the idolatrous Canaanites. The second break relates to the period of Samuel's administration, *between Eli and Saul*.

The chronology of these two breaks, therefore, being left to *conjecture*, we offer the following as that which to us reduces it to the greatest degree of certainty of which it is susceptible, and,

I. Of the period between the death of Moses and the first servitude, we offer the following: Caleb, when sent out as a spy with Joshua, was 40 years old,¹ to which add 39 years wanderings in the wilderness, Moses having sent him out on the *second* year of his

1. Joshua xiv., 7.

mission, and which together make 79 years. Now, supposing Joshua to be about the same age with Caleb, at his death he was 110 years old.¹ From this deduct the above 79 years, and it gives to Joshua between the death of Moses and his own death, 31 years. Then, to the *interregnum* which followed, to the time of their first servitude, including the period of the Judges which overlived Joshua, and the time of anarchy, we add 19 years — Josephus (no mean authority) assigns to this period 18 years. These together supply the first break with 50 years.

II. Of the other, between Eli and Saul, and which relates to the period of *Samuel's administration*, we offer the following: Samuel's *official* character was threefold. He acted as *Priest*,² as *Prophet*,³ and as *Judge*.⁴ Now, that Samuel was Judge *prior* to the anointing of Saul as the first king of Israel, is evident from 1 Sam. vii., 6, compared with chapters viii. — x., 1. Most chronologists assign to Samuel 21 years. But if we allow the full force of this passage, "and Samuel judged Israel *all the days of his life*;"⁵ i. e., from the *commencement* of his *judicial* authority to his *death*, which the Hebrew chronology places between 1099 and 1059 B. C.,⁶ it makes the whole num-

1. Josh. xxiv., 29.

2. 1 Sam. ii., 11, 18, 19; iii., 1.

3. 1 Sam. iii., 18 — 14; 15 — 20.

4. 1 Sam. vii., 6 — 15.

5. 1 Sam. vii., 15.

6. The dates B, C. of these events in our table will vary from the above. But as here introduced, they serve to shew that if any

ber of years of his administration as judge to be 40 years, which seems also to accord with the account given of him, 1 Sam. viii., 1. The 40 years assigned to Saul however, Acts xiii., 21, is to commence from Samuel's 24th year, ¹ at which point his *separate* administration ceased.

Before we proceed, however, to a recapitulation of the dates which belong to the period (the ivth) now under consideration, we claim the indulgence of a brief examination of that part of it of which Mr. Miller principally avails himself, in fixing upon A. D. 1843, as the termination of the 6000th year of the world. In his chronological table from Adam to Christ, as published in the "Signs of the Times"² of September 1, 1840; and again, with some *slight* alterations, in the "Report of the General Conference," &c., published in Boston, 1841,³ and of which he says, "if this chronology is not correct, I despair of getting from the Bible and History a true account of the age of the world;"⁴— he inserts for the 6th servitude under the *Philistines*, 40 years — to *Samson* 20 years, and to *Eli* 40 years, making a total of 100 years. If these dates in his table, therefore, can be shown as

two points of the chronology of our common English version agree in one instance, they may in another. There is such an agreement of the Hebrew Chronology of the *birth* and *death* of Moses, with his age, as given Deut. xxxiv., 7.

1. Mr. Miller, in his *revised* Chronological Table, allows to Samuel's administration as Judge, 24 years. Report, 1841.

2. Page 80.

3. Page 94.

4. Report, p. 93. *Note*.

obviously incorrect, we may spare ourselves the time and labor to point out its other inaccuracies.

In opposition to the above, then, we assume that the Scriptures assign but 40 years to this part of the chronology. Our position is as follows:—The 40 years of the 6th servitude under the Philistines, mentioned Judges xiii., 1, includes *the whole time of Eli*, he having succeeded *Abdon*, whose death is recorded, Judges, chap. xii., 14; and the *last* 20 years of Eli *includes* the 20 years assigned to *Samson*.

Proof. In 1 Sam. iv., 18, *Eli*, at his death is said to have judged Israel 40 years. The number of years, (viz. 1160 and 1120 B. C.) between the death of *Abdon*, Judges xii., 14, and that of *Eli*, 1 Sam. iv., 18, is just 40 years. *Eli*, therefore, was his *immediate successor*, as one of the *Judges* of Israel. The sacred narrative furnishes no other mode than this of determining the *commencement* of *Eli's* administration as Judge. Now, it is evident that the narrative which immediately follows the death of *ABDON*, gives an account of the *birth* of *Samson*, Judges xiii.;—not of the *commencement* of his *judicial* administration. At the time of *Samson's marriage* "the Philistines had *dominion* over Israel." Judges xiv., 4. *Samson* was then a *young man*, v. 10; say about 20 years of age. But it was at this *very time*, when his career as defender and deliverer of Israel *commenced*. "The spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan, between Zora and Astaol;" and when he came to his father and mother, asking them to procure as his wife the woman of Timnath, they knew

not that it was of *the Lord*," and "that he sought an occasion *against* the Philistines. Judges xiii., 25 ; xiv. 1 — 4.

If to this it be objected that, contrary to all precedent, it places *two* judges over Israel at the same time, viz., Eli and Samson, we reply, that this circumstance can by no means invalidate a plain historical fact. We remark, then, that the supineness and want of decision betrayed by *Eli* in his complex official capacities, (for he was both *Judge* and *High Priest*)¹ seemed to call for some additional provision for the defence of the enslaved and suffering Israelites, *while under servitude to the Philistines*, with which Eli's administration was cotemporaneous. This provision was made by raising up *Samson*, as the defender and deliverer of Israel during the last 20 years of Eli ; and if Scripture has any authority with Mr. Miller, I would respectfully refer to Judges xv., 20, which expressly says that Samson judged Israel *in the days of the Philistines* 20 years." Nor will this be thought singular, when, in addition to the *official inefficiency* of Eli, you add the consequent misrule of his two sons, *Hophni* and *Phinehas*.

The conclusion therefore is, that the *interval* between the death of Abdon and that of Eli, includes ALL that is narrated of the career of Samson, of Hophni and Phinehas, &c. In other words, the 40 years of *Eli*, and the 20 years of *Samson* are *included* in the 40 years of the SIXTH SERVITUDE. Here,

1. Compare 1 Sam. ii., 27, 28, with chap. ii., 22 — 25 ; and iii., 1 — 14. See also Townsend's Bible, Eng. Ed. vol. I, p. 608.

then, is a clear loss to Mr. Miller's chronology of 60 years!

The following is our tabular view of the IIIrd Period, from the death of Terah and call of Abraham to the Exodus; and of the IVth Period, as above, from the Exodus to the end of the reign of Saul.

| | Yrs. | Mo. | D. | A. M. | References. |
|------------------------------------------------|------|-----|----|-------|---------------------------------|
| Affliction and Bondage | 430 | | | | Exod. xii., 40, 41. |
| Wanderings..... | 40 | | | | Josh. v., 6. |
| Joshua after Moses..... | 31 | | | | <i>By Conjecture.</i> |
| Interregnum..... | 19 | | | | <i>By Conjecture.</i> |
| First Servitude..... | 8 | | | | See also Joseph Ant. Book 5. |
| TIME OF THE JUDGES. | | | | | |
| 1. Othniel..... | 40 | | | | — " 11. |
| Second Servitude..... | 18 | | | | — " 14. |
| 2. Ehud..... | 80 | | | | — " 30. |
| Third Servitude..... | 20 | | | | — iv. 3. |
| 3. Deborah and Barak.. | 40 | | | | — v. 31. |
| Fourth Servitude..... | 7 | | | | — vi. 1. |
| 4. Gideon..... | 40 | | | | — viii. 28. |
| 5. Abimelech..... | 3 | | | | — ix. 22. |
| 6. Tola..... | 23 | | | | — x. 2. |
| 7. Jair..... | 22 | | | | — " 3. |
| Fifth Servitude..... | 18 | | | | — " 8. |
| 8. Jephthah..... | 6 | | | | — xii. 7. |
| 9. Ibzan..... | 7 | | | | — " 9. |
| 10. Elon..... | 10 | | | | — " 11. |
| 11. Abdon..... | 8 | | | | — " 14. |
| Sixth Servitude, including the time of } .. | 40 | | | | .. xiii. 1. |
| Eli and Samson. } | | | | | |
| 12. Samuel..... | 24 | | | | <i>By Conjecture.</i> |
| SAUL. First King of Israel..... | 40 | | | | Acts xiii., 21. |
| * Total.... | 974 | | | | |

Now, it is a little singular, that, in the above table, the dates from the *Exodus* to "the time of *Samuel* inclusive, amounts to precisely the period of the

480 years as given in 1 Kings vi., 1. If to this we add the dates of St. Paul, Acts xiii., 17 — 22, for Samuel 24 years, and Saul 40 years; and also the dates beyond Saul as included in 1 Kings vi., 1, giving to David 40 years and to Solomon 3 years, the period of his commencing the erection of the Temple; and, compared with the commonly received Chronology, we discover a LOSS to *the true Scripture Chronology*, of more than 100 years! I will only add, that there are two ways in which this discrepancy may be accounted for. The one is, by attributing it to the carelessness of some early copyist, in mistaking the Hebrew numeral 7 4, for 7 5, (which, from the evident similarity in the main construction of each might easily be done,) or, to design.

Then again. Including the 24 years of Samuel in the above dates from the time of the division of the lands under Joshua in his 6th year, and it gives you the 450 years of Acts xiii., 20. That date cannot, by any possible construction, be applied *exclusively* to the period of the *Judges*; that period, from *Othniel* to *Samuel* amounting to no more than 382 years.

The following comprises our understanding of the import of the Apostle. "After" the division of the land by lot in the 6th year of Joshua, God "gave unto them judges, *about* the space of *four hundred and fifty years*," until after Samuel's administration, when they desired a king, &c. The 450 years attributed to the period of the Judges being qualified by the phrase "*about*," leaves open the door for the introduction of

the *conjectural* dates, without which, it is impossible to harmonize St. Paul with the old Testament.

V. We now proceed to the Fifth Period, which extends from the death of Saul, to the Babylonish Captivity. Here the evidence before us is clear and unobstructed.

| | Yrs. | Mo. | D. | A. M. | References. |
|----------------------------------|------|-----|----|-------|--------------------|
| TIME OF THE KINGS. | | | | | |
| 2. David | 40 | | | | 2 Sam. v., 4, 5. |
| 3. Solomon | | | | | 1 Kings v., 1, and |
| Temple begun in | | | | | " xi., 42. |
| his 4th year 3. } ..40 | 40 | | | | Compared. |
| Reigned after 37. } | | | | | |
| 4. Rehoboam..... | 17 | | | | 1 Kings xiv., 21. |
| 5. Abijah | 3 | | | | " xv., 2. |
| 6. Asa | 41 | | | | " — 10. |
| 7. Jehoshaphat | 25 | | | | " xxii., 42. |
| 8. Jehoram | 8 | | | | 2 Kings viii., 17. |
| 9. Ahaziah | 1 | | | | " — 26. |
| 10. Athaliah. (His mother.)..... | 6 | | | | " xi., 3. |
| 11. Joash | 40 | | | | " xii., 1. |
| 12. Amaziah..... | 29 | | | | " xiv., 2. |
| 13. Azariah..... | 52 | | | | " xv., 2. |
| 14. Jotham..... | 16 | | | | " — 33. |
| 15. Ahaz..... | 16 | | | | " xvi., 2. |
| 16. Hezekiah | 29 | | | | " xviii., 2. |
| 17. Manasseh | 55 | | | | " xxi., 1. |
| 18. Amon | 2 | | | | " .. 19. |
| 19. Josiah | 31 | | | | " xxii., 1. |
| 20. Jehoahaz..... | | 3 | | | " xxiii., 31. |
| 21. Jehoiakim..... | 11 | | | | " .. 36. |
| 22. Jehoiachin | | 3 | 10 | | " xxiv., 8. |
| 23. Zedekiah..... | 11 | | | | " .. 18. |
| Total..... | 473 | | | | |

VI. The Sixth Period embraces the duration of the Babylonish Captivity. To this, in the following tabular view, we add,

VII. The Seventh Period, including the interval between the end of the Babylonish Captivity, and the commencement of Daniel's 70 prophetic weeks.

| | Yrs. | Mo. | D. | A. M. | References. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|----|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Babylonish Captivity.... | 70 | | | | Jer. xxv., 11; Ezek. xxiv. 2; Zech. vii., 5. Book of Lamen. |
| Restoration of the JEWS under the PERSIAN kings, from the END of the Captivity in the First year of Cyrus, to the Commission of Ezra as Governor of Judea, in the Seventh year of Artax-Longimanus. | | | | | |
| 1. Cyrus..... | 7 | | | | Ezr. i., ii., iii. See also Isa. xlv., 28; & xlv., 1, 13. Prid. Con. i., 277. |
| 2. Ahasuerus. (<i>Cam- byses.</i>) | 8 | | | | Ezr. iv., 6. Prid. i., 324, 381, 382, 433 .. 436. Ezr. iv., 7. Prid. i., 330, 333 .. 335. |
| 3. Artaxerxes. (<i>Ma- gian, Smerdis.</i>) | | | | | |
| 4. Darius. (<i>Hystaspes.</i>) | | | | | |
| 5. Xerxes | 21 | | | | Ezr. iv., 5. Prid. i., 335, 381, 382. Prid. i., 408. |
| 6. Artax-Longimanus ... | 7 | | | | Neh. v., 14. Prid. i., 433 .. 436. |
| Total..... | 149 | | | | |

Of the 70 years captivity we remark, that while it is inserted in the above tabular view as following the 11th year of Zedekiah, it is to be understood as referring to the *thorough restoration* of the Jewish State which followed the decree of Darius, (*Hystaspes*) in his fourth year, *confirming* the previous decree of Cyrus; and which, down to the time of the utter destruction of the city by the Chaldeans, is just

70 years. "The time falling so exactly, and the prophet Zechariah confirming it by expressing, under the fourth year of Darius, that the mourning and fasting of the Jews for the destruction of Jerusalem, and the utter driving them out of the land, on the death of Gedaliah, was then just 70 years,¹" some have been led to place the beginning of the Captivity spoken of by Jeremiah, at the destruction of Jerusalem; and the end of them, at the publication of this decree of Darius. "But this matter will admit of a very easy reconciliation; for *both computations may well stand together*; for though the Babylonish captivity did *begin* from the 4th year of Jehoiakim, when "Nebuchadnezzar first subjugated the land, and carried away to Babylon the first captives; yet it was not *completed* till he had absolutely destroyed it in the 11th year of Zedekiah, which was just 18 years after. And so likewise though the deliverance from this captivity, and the restoration of the Jewish state thereon, was begun at the decree of Cyrus, in the first year of his reign; yet *it was not completed till that decree was put in full vigor of execution*, by the decree which Darius granted in the 4th year of his reign for the confirmation of it, which was also just 18 years after. — And therefore if we reckon *from the beginning of the captivity to the beginning of the restoration*, we must reckon from the 4th year of Jehoiakim to the 1st. year of Cyrus, which was just 70 years; and if we reckon (as in the above table) from *the completion of*

1. Zech. vii., 5.

the captivity to the completion of the restoration, we must reckon from the 11th year of Zedekiah to the 4th year of Darius, which was also just 70 years " 1

Let us now collect together the sum total of years of each of the preceding tables—

| | Yrs. | A. M. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|
| 1. From the Creation to the Flood. | 1656 | 1656 |
| 2. From the Flood to the death of Terah, and Abraham's departure from Haran. | 427 | 2063 |
| 3. Affliction and Bondage | 430 | 2513 |
| 4. From the Exodus to the end of the reign of Saul. | 544 | 3057 |
| 5. From the death of Saul, to the Babylonish captivity. | 473 | 3530 |
| 6. Babylonish Captivity..... | 70 | 3600 |
| 7. Interval between the end of the Babylonish Captivity, and the commencement of Daniel's 70 prophetic weeks..... | 79 | 3679 |
| Total | 3679 | |

At this point, we enter upon the *second division* of our Golden Chain of measurement, in determining the age of the world, viz,—

PROPHETIC CHRONOLOGY.

It will be seen that our deductions, as founded upon Sacred *Historic* chronology, furnish an aggregate number of 3679 years, from the Creation, down to the commencement of the 70 prophetic weeks of Daniel. Of prophetic chronology, the numbers upon which we are dependent to complete the 6000th year, as the period within which all God's purposes in relation to this world will be accomplished, are the following—

1. Prid. Con. Vol. ii., p. 146. Also Haber's hon. on the Proph. p. 16, 17.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Daniel's 70 weeks, or 490 years from which deduct } | 453 |
| A. D. 37, | 533 |
| Commencement of 1260 days. in A. D. | 1260 |
| The 1260 days of Daniel and St. John | 30 |
| Excess of 1290 days of Dan. xii., over 1260 | 45 |
| Excess of 1335 of Dan. xii., over 1290 | |
| | <hr/> |
| Total. | 2321 |
| Add the historical years as above..... | 3679 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 6000 |
| From..... | 2321 |
| Deduct..... | 453 |
| | <hr/> |
| And it gives you..... | 1868 |

as the period when, in the time of the 7th angel, Rev. xvi. 17, who pours out the last vial of judgement into the air, "a great voice out of the temple of Heaven, from the throne," will be heard, "saying, IT IS DONE !"

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| From | 1868 |
| Deduct | 1842 |
| | <hr/> |
| Which leaves | 26 |

In 26 short years, therefore, if the above prophetic numbers can be demonstrated to have their support in Scripture, that blessed period, the consummation of the devout believer's faith and hope will have arrived, when he who is "the Alpha and Omega," from his high and holy throne will proclaim, "BEHOLD, I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW." ¹

But, these prophetic numbers, if viewed in their relation to the events with which they stand connected, *past, present, and future*, all conspire to admonish us "upon, whom the ends of the world are come," ² that

1. Rev. xxi. 5.

2. 1 Cor. x. 11.

THE GREAT DAY OF CRISIS, both to the Church and to the world, is "just at hand," No—we are not to calculate upon 26 years additional probation, under the present existing economy of the Gospel! Look to 1847! May Heaven prepare us all to meet undismayed, the *terrors*, and to share triumphantly, in the *glories* of "THAT DAY!"¹

Perhaps, however, some one will ask, if, upon a *peradventure*, an error in the department of *historic chronology* as above, *should have escaped observation*, what then becomes of all these deductions? To this I reply, that, confident as I feel in the *correctness* of the historico-chronological department of my work, as herein exhibited; if the great Head of the Church has sent forth the Spirit of his grace, to reveal to the faithful a knowledge of Prophetical numbers,² and these prophetical numbers, as interpreted in the sequel are in accordance with "Holy Scripture;" then, I ask but a single admission, in order to demonstrate that, *independently* of immutable accuracy in giving the length of each link in the first half of our golden chain; the crisis, in A. D., 1847, and the "finis ang of the mystery of God,"³ in A. D., 1868, is established upon grounds of *equal* certainty. Prophecy points out to us the things that shall be *HEREAFTER*,⁴ even to the *last act* of the Almighty's government and providence over the world.⁵ The admission that I ask, is, that the *present*, is the year of our Lord, 1842, from the

1. Thess. v. 1—4; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii., 3; xvi., 15.

2. See p. p. 142—151.

3. Rev. x., 7.

4. Rev. i., 19.

5. Isa. xxviii., 21, 22,

NATIVITY. The following passage, the inaccuracies of Scriptural computations of Historical Chronology to the contrary notwithstanding, will fully explain our meaning. O that it was inscribed upon our hearts as with the finger of God, and with the pen of a diamond forever! "*We have also A MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in A DARK PLACE.*"¹

On entering upon the department of prophetic chronology, our first business will be to determine upon the *mode* of measuring time *prophetically*. The question here presenting itself is, whether prophetic numbers are to be understood *literally*, i. e., a day for a day—or as expressing time *indefinitely*—or (which is the system we shall adopt) whether these numbers are not to be understood **MYSTICALLY**, i. e., days, weeks, months, &c., as denoting days, weeks, and months of *years*.

Nor let any suppose that "the ancient of days,"² though his throne is in the heavens, and eternity his mantle, cannot condescend to stoop to the measures of time. Indeed, so far from this, "as if the Lord intended to prove his jealousy for his own predictions, he commands the prophet Ezekiel to record with the utmost fidelity the *very day* of the commencement of the 70 years captivity, as predicted by Jeremiah (xxv. 11.) "Son of man, write thee the name of the *day*, even of this *same day*; the king of Babylon set himself against Jerusalem *this same day*." (ch. xxiv., 2.)

1. 2 Pet., i. 19.

2. Dan. vii., 9, 12, 22.

Now, see the wisdom of God in all this — at the expiration of the 70 years captivity as predicted by Jeremiah, and recorded by Ezekiel, Daniel, who “*understood by books the number of the years* whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem, set his face unto the Lord his God.” (Dan. ix., 12.)

Equally defined are other, yea, and the major part of all the predictions of God’s word.

The prophecy of the deluge, as given to Noah (Gen. vi., 3.) was limited to 120 years.

The predicted affliction of the children of Israel was included within a specific number, viz., 430 years.¹

Still, of those predictions which have been *fulfilled*, there are several, the time of the fulfillment of which was *concealed*.

Of these, however, there is not one having the *least connexion* with those upon which we rely, in conducting our present inquiries.

With these *latter* predictions, however, a change now takes place in the *character* of the prophetic numbers. The successive evolutions of prophetic time are hidden under certain mystic forms. These, the Prophet Daniel tells us, “*none of the wicked shall understand* ; but **THE WISE SHALL UNDERSTAND.**” (ch. xii., 10.)

1. Gen. xv., 12 — 14. Acts vii., 6, 7. Exod. xii., 40 — 42. Gal. iii., 17.

Of this class of prophetic dates, there are in Daniel's prophecy the following :—

1. "*Seven times.*" Dan iv., 16.
2. "*Time, times, and dividing of time.*" Dan. vii., 25; xii., 7.
3. "*Two thousand three hundred days.*" Dan. viii., 14—26.
4. "*Seventy weeks.*" Dan. ix., 24.
5. "*A thousand, two hundred and ninety days.*" Dan. xii., 11, and,
6. "*The thousand, three hundred, and five and thirty days.*" (Dan. v., 12.)

In the Book of Revelation, also, are the following, viz. :—

7. "*An hour, a day, a month, and a year.*" Rev. ix., 15.
 8. "*A thousand, two hundred and threescore days.*" Rev. xii., 6.
 9. "*Forty and two months.*" (Rev. xi. 2; xiii. 5.)
 10. "*Six hundred and sixty-six.*" (Rev. xiii., 18.)
- And, in Ezekiel are the following :
11. "*Three hundred and ninety days.*" Ezek. iv., 5 ; and "*Forty days,*" verse 6.

Now, that the terms as used in these passages are *mystical* numbers, and are designed to be understood of a *year* for a *day*, &c., will, we think, appear conclusive from the following :—

1. "The spies searched the land forty days in unbelief, and a penalty of 40 years wandering in the wilderness was inflicted, "*a year for a day.*" (Num. xiv., 34.) Ezekiel was ordered to lie on his side 390

days to bear the 390 *years* iniquity of Israel, and 40 *days* for the 40 *years* iniquity of Judah, "*each day for a year.*" Ezek. iv., 5, 6.

But, should it still be objected, that these two instances of the use of the term day, to express a year, will not justify the application of the same sense to *all* the passages above named. we reply,

2. That these passages contain *internal evidence* that they are to be thus understood. Instance the following, as an illustration. "It is expressly declared that the seventy weeks of Dan. ix., 24, begins with the commandment to re-build the temple and city of Jerusalem; and that the building of them occupied the first *seven weeks.*" Who now will pretend that this work was accomplished in 49 *days*? The Evangelist St. John asserts, "*Forty and six years* was this temple in building,"¹ the *three* remaining years, as history asserts, being consumed in preparations for the work, under the ministrations of Haggai. We shall not at present enlarge on this point, as we shall have occasion again to bring it to your notice. Our immediate business now will be, to apply this mode of the prophetic interpretation of time, to their *practical* uses, and,

1. If we call the prophetic number of "seven times," (Dan. iv., 16,) which the prophet applies to the period of the dethronement and madness of the Chaldean king Nebuchadnezzar, seven years, and these years are interpreted as prophetic years, i. e., each year to con-

1. John ii., 20.

tain 360 days of years, a day for a year ; the whole number will amount to 2520, the half of which is precisely 1260.

2. Understanding the terms "Time," to mean 1 year of 360 days ; "Times," 2 years of 720 days ; and "the dividing of time" or "half a time" of 180 days, as used by the Prophets Daniel and St John, "each day for a year ;" 360, 720, and 180 added together make just 1260 years.

3. In the book of Revelation, (chap. xi. 2,) the court of the mystic temple and the holy city is given to be trodden under foot of the Gentiles, "forty and two months." By allowing 30 days to each month, and multiplying the 42 months by 30, we have just 1260 days, "each day for a year."

4. The 2300 days of Daniel viii. 14, are 2300 years, "each day for a year."

5. The "seventy weeks" of Dan. ix. 24, are 490 years.

6. The 1290 days of Dan. xii. 11, are 1290 years.

7. The 1335 days of Dan. xii. 12, are 1335 years.

8. The 1260 days of Rev. xii. 6, and the "forty and two months," Rev. xi. 2, xiii. 5, are 1260 years. And,

9. The 390 days, and the 40 days of Ezekiel iv. 5, are each to be taken for so many years. See Rev. ix. 15. And,

10. The mystical number of 666, (Rev. xiii. 18,) denotes so many years.

Now, of these *larger* mystical numbers, four of them, viz :—"the time, times, and dividing of time" of Daniel ; the "time, times, and half a time" of

St. John; together with the "42 months" and "1260 days" of the latter, all amount to *the same number* of 1260 mystical years. Then there is the 2520 years of Daniel iv. 16, which doubles the number of 1260 years. Also, the 1290 years of Daniel xii. 11; the 1335 years of the same chapter, verse 12; and the 2300 years of Daniel viii. 14.

Our next remark in reference to these larger numbers is, that the first four, each counting 1260 prophetic years, as they relate to the *same events*, (those of the Revelation *synchronizing* with those of Daniel,) furnishing thereby a history of the fortunes of the Church during her wilderness state, and comprehending the period of the wearing out of the Saints of the most High, the witnesses prophesying in sack-cloth, the woman driven in the wilderness, and, the treading under foot of the holy City;—so they all *commence* and *terminate* together. With these also, the "seven times" or 2520 years of Daniel iv., 16, have a *common termination*. Of two of the remaining three larger numbers,—viz., 1290, 1335, and 2300; the first, or 1290 years of Daniel xii., 11, go *beyond* the above termination to the number of 30 years; and the second, or 1335 years, exceeds that again by an *advance* of 45 years.

What remains for us now is, to select from among these larger prophetic numbers, one which will afford *the least questionable evidence*, as to its commencement and termination. And the one which we shall select for this purpose is, the 2300 days of Daniel viii., 14.

In the preceding Chapter, (vii.,) this prophet had a vision of four great beasts rising out of the sea; the fourth having 10 horns, among which arose a little horn;—together with a view of the kingdom of Christ: which vision was interpreted by an Angel to denote the rise successively of four great Monarchies, viz., the *Babylonian*, the *Medo-Persian*, the *Grecian*, and the *Roman*: but all of which were to be destroyed, to make way for the kingdom of God. The general tenor of the vision, however, bespoke great trials to God's people. Daniel was troubled at the sight of "*the little horn*," of the 8th verse; for "the same made war with the Saints, and prevailed against them." (v. 21.)

This vision is followed by another in Chapter viii., of the Ram and the He-Goat, with which was also connected a "little horn," verses 9, 23; the resemblance between which and the little horn of the preceding vision as to the fierceness of his character, filled the mind of the prophet with the most alarming apprehensions of the future, accompanied with a strong desire to understand it. "I Daniel," says he, "fainted and was sick certain days, and I was astonished at the vision; but none understood it."

In this state of mind, the prophet, understanding by the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, that the period of the 70 years captivity was about to expire, he ushers in the joyous event by offering prayer and confession in behalf of his people.

While engaged in this holy exercise, the angel Gabriel, whom he had seen in the vision of Chap. viii

came to him, and said, "O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, for I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved, therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." (v. 23.) -

Now, what was the matter of particular Revelation by the Angel to Daniel? Read the 13th verse of the viiiith Chapter. Daniel "heard one saint" ask "another," "*how long* shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" The answer was, "unto 2300 days." (v. 14.) This therefore was the point which Daniel desired to understand. And this was the matter revealed to him by the angel: and, in the following manner, —

From the 2300 days, Daniel is told to deduct 70 weeks or 490 days, as a season of mercy to the Jews, upon their restoration, the details of which are given as follows: the 490 days are divided into 3 parts, thus, — 1st. Seven weeks, or 49 days, during which the commandment was sent forth to restore and build Jerusalem. — 2nd. 62 weeks, or 434 days, within which period Messiah's first advent should occur. And 3rd, one week, or 7 days, in which, (1.) Messiah should be cut off — (2.) the covenant should be established with many for or during the whole week, — and (3.) in the midst of the week, sacrifice and oblation should cease: i. e., the sacrifices and obla-

tions of the Mosaic Economy should terminate forever, by the one sacrifice of Christ "once for all."

But, it is to be remembered, that the Revelation of the Angel Gabriel to Daniel did not close here. The events in detail of the 70 weeks having received their accomplishment, the prophet is informed that "the City and Sanctuary" should be "destroyed" by "the people of the prince that should come," "the end of which should be with a flood," and that unto the end of the war, "desolations" were "determined;" and that "for the overspreading of abominations he should make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined, shall be poured upon the desolator." This period relates to the remainder of the 2300 days.

Of these days, however, as we have said, *years* must be understood; for, as the city and temple of Jerusalem could not have been rebuilt in 47 literal days, so the 2300 days of Chap. viii., if taken literally, would not have afforded scope sufficient for the first events of that vision; which, as they relate to the conflicts between the ram and the he-goat, occupy the reigns of the five kings of Persia down to Alexander king of Greece. But this is not all. The aggregate of the events in this vision reach down to *the cleansing of the sanctuary*, (viii., 14,) with which the "indignation" is to "*end*." (verses 17, 19.) The city and temple of Jerusalem, however, are *still* in the hands of the spoiler. The Jews *yet remain* a people, "scattered and peeled." The "*indignation*" is *not*

yet come to a "full end." The 2300 days *have not yet expired*.

We come now to observe, that we are furnished with internal evidence that the 2300 days of Chap. viii., 14, and the 70 weeks of Chap. ix., 24, have a common commencement, as that the days and weeks mean days and weeks of years. For, as the events detailed in the 70 weeks, and which commenced with "*the command to restore and to build Jerusalem*," ch. ix., 25, were all to receive their fulfilment *before* the commencement of "the overspreading of abominations," (v. 27,) which, like the desolating lava of a volcano, was to lay waste the fairest inheritance of God's ancient but rebellious people to the *end* of the 2300 years; and, as the 70 weeks or 490 years were to be *deducted* from the 2300 years, it follows, that both these prophetic numbers commence with the above command, to restore and build Jerusalem.

As, however, there were no less than THREE of the above named commands, delivered by three different kings (viz., Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes Longimanus, Ezra vi., 4,) at three different periods, it becomes a matter of vast importance in these premises to determine from which *one* of the three the above 70 prophetic weeks, and 2300 days date their commencement.*

* To correct a misapprehension as to the time whence we are to date the commencement of Daniel's 70 prophetic weeks, which is, that it *immediately followed* the decree issued by Cyrus, we remark, that, according to the learned Prideaux, under this decree "the State of Judah and Jerusalem" only "*began to be restored*." And that it was not until the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, under the reign

Happily, even admitting that the chronology of that period, as some contend, is exceedingly confused, the fulfilment of the events as detailed in the 70 weeks, furnish what to our mind is irrefragible evidence, in determining the point of our inquiry. Irrefragible, we say, because that evidence is *internal*.

First. Take the "one week," (v. 27,) which is the last of the 70, and during which the covenant was to be confirmed with many. Now, it was "*in the midst of this week*" that Messiah was to be "*cut off*." Here we avail ourselves of the general acknowledgment that Christ commenced his ministry at 30 years of age,¹ and that he exercised that ministry among the Jews only for precisely *three years and a half*, when he was crucified. It is also admitted that, commencing immediately *after his death*, the gospel was preached to the Jews only for *three years and a half*, when, by the conversion of Cornelius, the partition wall between Jew and Gentile was broken down, and the Gospel was proclaimed equally to all.

On the subject of the termination of the last week of the 70, placing it at the conversion of Cornelius, ra-

of Artaxerxes Longimanus, that the church and state of the Jews, by virtue of several decrees, were finally and thoroughly restored. With this representation agrees Ezra vi., 14, which plainly intimates that "*the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem*" mentioned Dan. ix., 25, was reiterated through the reigns successively of *Cyrus, Darius Hystaspes, and Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

As an aid to those who would wish to examine this subject minutely, I would respectfully refer them to the references appended to the tabular view of the viith Period, pages 219 & 240 of this work.

1. Luke iii., 23.

ther than at the crucifixion, "in the midst" (middle or first half) of which, Messiah was to be "cut off," we find ourselves at issue with the learned Prideaux, who, in order to complete the establishment of the covenant with many for that week, brings in the ministry of John the Baptist. But, we respectfully submit, that while this places the *cutting off* of Messiah at the *end* of the week, which seems to contradict Dan. ix., 27; it assigns also to the nature and design of John's ministry, as the *forerunner* of Christ, what does not belong to it. True, of that distinguished personage it is said, that "among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a *greater*" than he; and Christ himself testified both to the spirituality and superiority of his ministry over all that had preceded it. He was "more than a prophet." Still, says the Savior, "He that is *least* in THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN is *greater* than he." Now, if we understand of this the *Christian dispensation*, then John the Baptist was not "*in*" it—he did not *belong to it*. This was evidently the dispensation which he had set forth as "*at hand*," i. e. as not yet established. The old prophets had declared that Christ was *coming*; John showed that Christ *was then among them*. But it remained for the Apostles and their successors "to prove that this Christ *has suffered*, and *entered into his glory*, and that *repentance and remission of sins are proclaimed through his blood*." John was beheaded, and his ministry sealed by his blood, ere the Messiah, whose way he proclaimed, had been betrayed, or tried, or condemned, or crucified, or was risen from the

dead, or ascended to heaven ; and the apostolical college was restricted to those who were eye and ear witnesses to all these things.

The ministry of John the Baptist then, we say, was an *intermediate* ministry, between the abrogation of the Old and the introduction of the New Dispensation. Hence, having accomplished the object for which it was designed, it ceased to exist. This is evident from the following considerations :—

I. John declares that he received his commission, not from Christ, *but from the FATHER*. Accordingly, we find him declaring, “ He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.” It was not until after this that John “ saw and bear record, that he (as Christ) was the Son of God.” *Before* that period, John positively declared, “ *I knew him not* ; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come, baptizing with water.” It is evident, therefore, that his was not the Christian ministry, inasmuch as that ministry could only originate in the *express command* and *authority* of JESUS CHRIST.

II. The ministry of John the Baptist required, not *faith* in Christ, but *repentance*, or reformation of life, suitable to the appearance of such an august personage: except, indeed, that the exercise of faith was obligatory, upon a conviction on their part, that the miracles performed by Christ during his ministry should sufficiently attest the divinity of his Messiahship. The

burden of his cry was, "prepare ye the way of the Lord; make his paths straight." Even himself deferred the exercise of implicit faith in him of whose works he had merely heard while in prison, till the miracles wrought by Christ *in the presence of his disciples* were communicated to him. His, therefore, could not have been the Christian ministry.

III. Again, John's ministry was destitute of an external sign or seal, such as that which distinguishes the Christian dispensation. True, he baptized—but he did not baptize in the name of THE SACRED TRINITY: FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST. His baptism and that of Christ, are represented in Scripture as separate and distinct, from the *peculiar* and *transcendent effects* of the latter. In support of this, we have his own declaration — "I indeed," says he, "baptize you with water unto repentance; but there cometh one after me mightier than I; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And to place the matter beyond the reach of all reasonable doubt, St. Paul, while at Ephesus, having ascertained there were some in that place who had been baptized, but who were ignorant of the accompanying influences of the Holy Ghost attendant upon all Christian converts, enquired, "Into what, then, were ye baptized?" And they replied, "Into John's baptism;" and after he had explained to them the nature of John's baptism, "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

The conclusion therefore is, that the ministry of John the Baptist, as it formed no part of the *Christian*

dispensation, so it could not form a part of "the *covenant* confirmed with many" during the *last* of the 70 weeks.

In reference to the conversion of Cornelius, A. D. 37, it is objected, that it does not agree with the marginal chronology of that event in the New Testament. But to this we reply, that "though it may not be in our power to fix *with precision* the time of the conversion of Cornelius from the narrative of the Acts, yet it is easy to show that the date given to it in the margin of our Bibles, which is wholly arbitrary and unsupported, must be too late; and that the year 37 agrees much better with the facts that are known. The stoning of Stephen took place in 34, or early in 35, and the conversion of Paul in the course of 35, to allow time for his two visits to Jerusalem mentioned in Galatians, with an interval of three years, and fourteen years between them: all occurring before the Council, in Acts xv.: the dissensions leading to which are referred to in Gal. ii. 11; and which Council could not be later than 52. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem was therefore in 38, and Peter was at Jerusalem, Gal. i. 18; and the persecution raised about Stephen had ceased. Acts ix. 31; xi. 19. But at this visit to Jerusalem, Paul received his commission to go to the Gentiles, Acts xxii. 21; and began to dispute with the Grecians, Acts ix. 29, at the time when the disciples at Antioch did the same; Acts xi. 20: all which proves that the door had then been opened to the Gentiles by the conversion of Cornelius, as otherwise these proceedings could not have been sanctioned by the Church in

sending forth Barnabas, Acts xi. 22, and their even sending Paul to Cesarea, the abode of Cornelius, Acts ix. 30, indicates the same thing ; and Barnabas sought his help as the chosen vessel to the Gentiles. Acts xi. 25, ix. 30.

The conversion of Cornelius therefore *must have taken place before* 38. We should recollect that the transactions in the Acts are not given in the regular sequence of time, but one narrative is followed out to its close, and then another taken up, though it should require going back in order of time : as is evidently the case, chap. xi. 19, which returns to chap. viii. 1.¹

The conclusion therefore is, that, the 70 weeks or 490 years of Daniel, ending at the conversion of Cornelius A. D. 37, together with the 2300 years, are to be dated from the command to restore and build Jerusalem as given to Ezra in the 7th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

As collateral evidence, however, of the correctness of the above chronology of the commencement and termination of the 70 weeks of Daniel, we offer the following succession in the line of the High Priesthood, &c., from the time of its investment of the *civil* power, upon the annexing of *Judea* to the Prefecture of Syria, as furnished by Prideaux, reaching to the Commencement of Christ's ministry, at 30 years of age.

1. Pym. Appendix, p. 118, 119.

| Succession. | Years | References. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------|
| HIGH PRIESTHOOD. | | |
| 1 Joiada | 37 | Neh. xii. 10. Prid. ii. 205 to 265 |
| 2 Johanan (<i>Jonathan</i>). | 32 | do do 11. do 265 " 290 |
| 3 Jaddua | 20 | do do 11. do 290 " 350 |
| 4 Onias I. | 21 | Prid. vol. ii. 350 " 395 |
| 5 Simon <i>the Just</i> | 9 | do do 395 " 411 |
| 6 Eleazar | 16 | do do 411 |
| 7 Manasseh | 26 | do vol. iii. 113 " 225 |
| 8 Onias II. | 33 | do do 113 " 154 |
| 9 Simon II. | 22 | do do 154 " 183 |
| 10 { Onias III. } | 27 | { 183 " 215 215 " 220 220 " 299 |
| 11 { Jason } | | |
| 12 { Manelaus } | | |
| PRINCES OF JUDAH. | | |
| 1 Judas Maccabeus, | 6 | do do 252 " 335 |
| 2 Jonathan, | 17 | do do 335 " 375 |
| 3 Simon, | 8 | do do 375 " 395 |
| 4 John Hyrcanus, | 29 | do do 395 iv. 7 |
| KINGS OF JUDAH. | | |
| 1 Aristobulus I. | 1 | do vol. iv. 7 to 13 |
| 2 Alex. Jannæus, | 27 | do do 13 " 43 |
| 3 Alexandra, | 9 | do do 43 " 62 |
| 4 Aristobulus II. | 6 | do do 62 " 99 |
| 5 Hyrcanus II. | 24 | do do 99 " 193 |
| 6 Antigonus, | 2 | do do 193 " 204 |
| 7 { HEROD THE GREAT, .. | 33 | { do do 204, 359 " 362 do do 368 " 370 |
| { Christ born in his 33rd | | |
| { year, | | |
| { Herod's last year, | 1 | |
| 8 Archelaus, | 10 | do do 371 " 373 |
| 9 Augustus, | 6 | do do 373 " 379 |
| 10 Tiberius Cæsar, | 12 | do do 379 " 384 |
| The "62 weeks" of Dan. ix. 26, | | |
| Add the "7 weeks" Dan. ix. 25, | 434 | |
| Christ's ministry 3 yrs 6 mo. to conver. of Cor. 3 yrs 6 mo. which make the "one" or last week, Dan. ix. 27, .. | 49 | |
| TOTAL..... | | |
| | 490 | or, |
| EZRA 13 Ezr. vii. 11 — Do. ii. 13, 15; 190. | | |
| NEHEMIAH 1 Neh. i. 1 — 6; — v. 6. Prid. ii. 146 — 151. | | |
| First Commission Second do 11 " v. 14; ii. 6; Do. ii. 151. | | |
| His Return to Persia. 5 " xiii. 6, 7. Do. ii. 190. | | |
| Third Commis- sion, to the Close of the old Testa- ment Canon 19 " — 7 — 22. Do. ii. 208 — 225. | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| EZRA | 13 | Ezr. vii. 11 — Do. ii. 13, 15; 190. |
| NEHEMIAH | 1 | Neh. ii. 1 — 6; — |
| First Commission | | " — v. 6. Prid. ii. 146 — 151. |
| Second do | 11 | " v. 14; ii. 6; Do. ii. 151. |
| His Return to Persia | 5 | " xiii. 6, 7. Do. ii. 190. |
| Third Commis- sion, to the Close of the old Testa- ment Canon | 19 | " — 7 — 22. Do. ii. 208 — 225. |
| | 49 | |

We proceed, therefore, to observe, that the death of the Savior at the termination of his three and a half years' ministry on the one hand, and the conversion of Cornelius, after the three and a half years of the apostolic ministry among the Jews on the other, together make up the "one," or last of the 70 prophetic weeks; and, added to the 30 years of Christ's age when he commenced his ministry, it demonstrates that the 70 weeks closed A.D. 37. Now, carry back the 70 weeks, or 490 years from A. D. 37, to the era B. C., and you have the date of "the command to restore and to build Jerusalem," B. C. 453, or A. M. 3679. Then, the 2300 years beginning at the same time, we ascertain their termination merely by deducting the years before the incarnation, which brings us down to A. D. 1847.

But by what event is the close of 2300 years to be signalized? Answer: The cleansing of the sanctuary, the accomplishment of the vision — the last end of the indignation. Dan. viii. 14—19; 23—27. In other words, that in A. D. 1847 the Lord Jehovah will appear for the restoration and re-establishment in Palestine of the seed of Abraham, which he swore unto their fathers.

Thus have we disposed of the first prophetical number of 453, from the commencement of Daniel's 70 weeks to the nativity; or 490, by the addition thereto of A. D. 37, to the conversion of Cornelius, as having a common commencement with the 2300 years. But, as we have seen, the year A. D. 1847, as the terminating point of the 2300 years, when added to A. M. 4132 from the creation, still leaves

21 years *minus* the 6000. There are however, three other numbers of the "more sure word of prophecy," which, as in the other instance, calculating the present as A. D. 1842, defines the period when "THE MYSTERY OF GOD" in Providence and Redemption shall be "FINISHED." These are, the three following numbers of Daniel xii., 7, 11, 12, viz., "a time, times, and an half," or 1260 years, — 1290 years, — and 1335 years.

The point first to be determined in reference to these numbers is, *whether they all commence at the same period of time.* In order to this, it will be necessary to attach some definite idea to the *descriptions* given in the imagery of the prophet Daniel, of the *two powers* spoken of, — the first, Chap. vii., 8, 20, 24, 25, and the second, Chap. viii., 8, 9, 10, 11, first clause, verses 23 — 25. Chap. xi., 31 — 45, and Rev. xiii. The *works* also to be accomplished by them respectively claims our special regard. Those of the first are described in Chap. vii., 21, 24, 25; and of the second, Chap. viii., 10 — 12, 24, 25, xi., 31 — 45, xii., 7., and Rev. xiii.

Now, the descriptions given by the prophet of the fierceness of character, and the persecuting, destructive career of these two powers, plainly indicate, as we have already said, a *strong resemblance* of the one to the other: and, united, they are designed to set forth the various *persecuting* powers which were to try the integrity of the Church, and to impress upon her the momentous truth, that "*through much tribulation,*"

the faithful within her militant pale, were to "enter into the kingdom of God." ¹ Hence,

1. Both these powers, in their persecuting career, direct their rage and malice against a *common object*. The "little horn" of Daniel vii., 8, "*makes war with the Saints, and prevails against them,*" and "*wears them out.*" (v. 20, 24.) And the "little horn" of Chap. viii., 9, "*waxes great, even to the host of heaven, some of whom, with the stars, he casts to the ground, stamps upon, and destroys the mighty and the holy people.*" (v. 10, 24.)

2. To the commencement and termination of both these powers is set a fixed and unalterable period. "The Saints of the most High" were given into the hand of the little horn of Daniel vii., 8, for "*a time, times, and dividing of time.*" (v. 25.) And the little horn of Chap. viii., 9, "the king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences," (v. 23,) was to prosper, and practice, and destroy the mighty people, for "*a time, times, and an half.*" (Chap. xii., 7.)

3. To both, (following a supposed long-established and generally received opinion on this subject,) as we shall now show, by a most extraordinary coincidence, is attached the same *numerical* mark, viz., 666. Rev. xiii., 18; xiv., 11. And,

1. Of the *Papal Beast*. "It was customary with the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins, (or Romans,) to use the *letters of their Alphabet*, to keep accounts by, instead of *figures*, which were of much later invention; the same ancient practice, (in part,) prevails to this day, according to the old Roman custom; as you may

perceive on books, medals, monuments, or public buildings ; e. g., MDCCXCIII, is put for 1793, which in Hebrew characters is thus deciphered, יחמ"ג 1793, and in Greek thus, αψηγ 1793.

"Now, the Holy Spirit knowing, that notwithstanding men and nations would change their customs and manners, by being overturned, yet still their *numeral* letters would remain in use to the latest posterity. He therefore in infinite wisdom thought fit to describe the *mark or name* of the *Popish Beast* by *numeral letters*, that thereby it might unalterably remain, and so not only appear both a *mark* and a *name*, but a *numeral* name, or a name distinguished by the coincidence of its numbers, viz., 666 ; which number, being pointed out by a most remarkable circumstance, (and of which we shall speak presently,) happening in the corresponding century, it could not be possibly mistaken, forgotten, altered, or lost.

"On these accounts, (among others) no doubt the Holy Ghost gave the true *sign or mark* of the monster, in cypheral characters, as constitute the number 666, by a singular combination" of the three above named languages. "Nor is it a little astonishing" that this same number, "without a unit over or under should be found in the composition of the name, which has in it a combination of all those languages in which the (Pagan ?) beast wrote the inscription over our blessed Lord's head on the Cross, viz., "Latin, Greek, and Hebrew."¹

Now, apply this number to the name and character

1. Luke xxiii., 38.

of the Papal beast "as a man, a Roman, of the Latin nation;" and it will be found exactly to make out the *mark* of his name, thus, רמקש, *Romanus*, λατινος, *Latinus*; both which, when received as *letters*, may be called the *mark* of his name; but when considered as *numerals* or *figures*, (of which both words entirely consist,) may then be called the *number* of his name, or the *number of a man*, being a Latin name derived from that of Romulus, a man, who founded Rome, *Pagan*, and so peculiar to a man, viz., the POPE, who is the foundation of Rome *Papal*."

"Now observe. The Hebrew and Greek letters composing the words רומייה, *Romiith*, — רמקש, *Romanus*, — or λατινος, *Latinus*, each of them making in numerals exactly 666, — plainly point out not only his *name* and the *number* of his name, but also the *mark* of his name; e. g., in

ר מ י ה ק ש
400. 10. 10. 40. 6. 200. *Romiith*. 666.

So likewise

ש נ ע מ ר
300. 6. 50. 70. 40. 200. *Romanus*. 666;

And also the Greek,

λ α τ ι ν ο ς
30. 1. 300. 5. 10. 50. 70. 200. *Latinus*. 666.

in each of which the exact mark is contained."

"It therefore evidently appears, that each name is both a mark and a number; a *mark*, when viewed as made up of so many letters, therefore called the *mark of his name*; a *number*, when viewed as made up of so many numerals, thence called the *number of his*

name. But when considered merely as a name derived from *Romiith*, a Roman, or *Romulus*, the founder of Rome, a name common among men, it may then properly be called *the number of a man*; in scripture dialect, a "*man of sin.*" of uncommon sin."*

We proceed therefore in this last sense, first to apply this name to the "little horn" of Daniel vii., 8, as the

FRONTLET OF THE (PAPAL) BEAST.

It is to be observed as a singular circumstance, that the title, VICARIUS FILII DEI, (*Vicar of the Son of God*,) which the Popes of Rome have assumed to themselves, and caused to be inscribed over the door of the Vatican, exactly makes the number of 666 when deciphered according to the numeral signification of its constituent letters, thus,

* I cannot leave this subject without remarking, how singular it is, that Christ should have suffered under a conjunction of these three powers, viz. the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins; and that his inscription was also written in all their three languages; farther, that Antichrist has also reigned in a conjunction of the same: a d as this mark is likewise contained in a combination of them, may it not therefore, according to the nature of correspondencies, be expected, that the visible destruction of the man of sin, and the establishment of Christ's reign, will be manifested in a conjunction of these three kindred, people, and tongues? So that by the same instruments that Christ has been abased, and Antichrist exalted, Antichrist shall be abased, and Christ alone exalted."

Vicar *of the Son* *of God.*
V I C A R I V S F I L I I D E I. added
 5. 1. 100. 1. 5. 1. 50. 1. 1. 500. 1. together thus:

V..... 5
 I..... 1
 C..... 100
 A..... 0
 R..... 0
 I..... 1
 V*..... 5
 S..... 0

F..... 0
 I..... 1
 L..... 50
 I..... 1
 I..... 1

D..... 500
 E..... 0
 I..... 1

The number of the Beast..... 666

* Answer to a querist, respecting the mark of the Beast.

SIR,

In answer to your observation and queries, permit me to say, — the things I have asserted are stubborn clear facts, not mere suppositions or fancies.

The inscription in question was actually written over the door of the Vatican at Rome in express Latin words and characters, as inserted in this publication, viz. VICARIUS FILII DEI; and those Latin words and characters, contain Latin numerals to the amount of 666, exactly corresponding with the number of the beast.

With respect to the supposition you have conjured up, that the Pope might be called *Vicarius Christus*, or *Vicarius Christus Filii Dei*, (a sort of gibberish that is neither Latin, German, nor English,) it is a matter I have nothing to do with. Mr. D. may adopt these

"It may be farther observed, that not many centuries back, on the *front* of the POPE'S MITRE, the word

MYSTERY

used to be inscribed, and was worn by them till the Reformers discovered and pointed it out to the people, as the scripture mark of Anti-Christ, from Rev. xvii., 5, which glaring manifestation of "the man of sin" so opened the eyes of the multitude, that the custom was immediately abolished, and the word *erased* from the mitre." ¹

"Even those who are unacquainted with the languages may, by comparing the characters and numbers, (as given in the following table,) satisfy themselves of the truth of the foregoing assertions."

But we observe,

2. That, by a most extraordinary coincidence, as

or any other fancies to amuse himself, and to screen the head of his holiness; but when he has done all, this question will still remain to be answered. Have those inscriptions ever appeared over the door of the Vatican at Rome?

As to Mr. D——'s attempting to obscure the number of the beast 666, contained in the numerals of the words VICARIUS FILII DEI, by objecting to a V; however the Pope or his emissaries may be obliged to him for his kind exertions on their behalf, yet I presume neither of them will condescend to appear his humble fool in Latin, for the sake of sheltering themselves under his ignorance of the Latin alphabet and of ancient inscriptions.

Let Mr. D—— but put his hand into his pocket, and examine a common halfpenny, he will then see, that a whole nation have unanimously adopted that practice which Mr. D——'s wisdom cannot discover the propriety of, viz. retaining the use of the ancient Latin V in preference to the U, as he will find by the inscription, viz. GEORGIUS not GEORGIUS.

1. Flemings key to the Apocalypse. Appendix, pp. 105 — 108.

NUMERAL LETTERS, AS FORMERLY USED BY THE NATIONS OF THE
LATINS, GREEKS, AND HEBREWS.

| LATINS | | GREEKS | | and | | HEBREW. | | | |
|--------|------|--------|-----|-----|---------|---------|-----|---------|-----|
| M. | 1000 | α | 1 | σ | 200 | א | 1 | פ | 80 |
| D. | 500 | β | 2 | τ | 300 | ב | 2 | צ | 90 |
| C. | 100 | γ | 3 | υ | 400 | ג | 3 | ק | 100 |
| L. | 50 | δ | 4 | φ | 500 | ד | 4 | ר | 200 |
| X. | 10 | ε | 5 | χ | 600 | ה | 5 | ש | 300 |
| V. | 5 | ς | 6 | ψ | 700 | ו | 6 | ת | 400 |
| I. | 1 | ζ | 7 | ω | 800 | ז | 7 | FINALS. | |
| | | η | 8 | π | 900 | ח | 8 | | |
| | | θ | 9 | α | 1000 | ט | 9 | | |
| | | ι | 10 | β | 2000 | י | 10 | | |
| | | κ | 20 | γ | 3000 | כ | 20 | | |
| | | λ | 30 | δ | 4000 | ל | 30 | | |
| | | μ | 40 | ε | 5000 | מ | 40 | | |
| | | ξ | 60 | ς | 10,000 | ם | 60 | | |
| | | ο | 70 | τ | 20,000 | נ | 70 | | |
| | | π | 80 | υ | 100,000 | ס | 80 | | |
| | | ι | 90 | φ | 200,000 | ש | 90 | | |
| | | ρ | 100 | σ | | ת | 100 | | |

some contend, this same numerical mark of 666, composes the name also of the great Mahometan imposter. His name in Greek, *Μαμετις*, *Mahomet*, composes exactly the number of 666. Thus,

M *α* *ο* *μ* *ς* *τ* *ι* *ς*
 40 1 70 40 5 300 10 200 — 666. *

This circumstance has led some to conjecture that

* As the word *Μαμετις* must be regarded with complacency by those who consider Mahomet to have been the Antichrist, it will be proper here to state the objection to it, which is principally on account of the *Orthography*. The Romish Bishop Walmsley adopts it as written above on the authority, as he says, of Euthymius, Zonares, and Cadrenus; and considers that it will be some *future* Turkish Anti-christ, who will adopt the name of *Mahomet*. Mr. Faber, however, has shown that the authorities of the Bishop are a

this number belonged *exclusively* to that remarkable man.¹ In our view, however, the utmost that can be claimed in these premises is, that it will apply only as merged in, and comprehended under, the greater and more obvious anti-Christian power, in its Papal form; the Mahometan anti-Christian power being thus distinguished, from the circumstance of its running a career parallel, or nearly so, with that of the former. Nor can this view fail to derive material strength from the fact, that this numerical mark, as applied to the anti-Christian character of the Popedom, harmonizes precise'y with the *date* of its assumption of that form which the elements of its *earlier* existence, in the relation of *cause* and *effect*, was calculated to produce, viz. its tyranny over the consciences of men, by the adoption (to the exclusion of the primitive forms) of a mode of religious worship which, to the great mass, is in an "*unknown tongue*."²

daring fabrication of his own, as they all write the word differently from each other and from him: thus,

Μουχουμετ,—Cedrenus.

Μωμεθ,—Zonares.

Μωμεθ,—Euthymius.

The latter also writes as Zonares. The following are additional instances of different modes of writing it adduced by Mr. Faber.

Μωμεθ,—Nicetas.

Μεχμερης,—Chalcocondylas.

Μαχμετ,—Cantacuzenes.

Μεχμετ,—Ducas Michael.

Μαχουμερης,—Joannes Cananus.

In none of the above names is it *Μαμερης*; and Mr. Rabbell further contends that this is not a proper Greek termination, as it should be either *τος*; or *της*." Brook's Elem. of Proph. Inter., p. 315.

1. Investigator, vol. ii., pp. 400—403.

Now, it is a matter of historic verity, that "in A. D. 666, Pope Vitalian first ordained that public worship should be performed in the *Latin language*, and popery really became the Latin Church." As therefore the number of the Papal Beast is found in the name *Latinus*, (and with which corresponds the Hebrew *Romiith*, and the Greek *λατινος*) it can apply to no other than to the western, or *Romish Church*, whose subjects "are universally called *Latins*; and it is true as an able commentator¹ has expressed it, they *latinise every thing* ; masses, prayers, hymns, litanies, canons, bulls, in short, everything is in Latin ; the Papal councils *speak Latin*, nor is Scripture itself read in any other language under Popery than *Latin*. The council of Trent commanded the *vulgar Latin* to be the *only authentic* version; nor do their doctors doubt to prefer it to the *Hebrew* and *Greek* text, in which it was written by the Prophets and Apostles ; and, moreover, the Pope has communicated this language unto the people as *the mark and character of the Empire*."

Finally, respecting this number we remark, that while its numeral letters, which indicate the *name* of the Beast, are designed to "show his character, or the copy of his countenance;" the direction given Rev. xiii., 18, to "*count his number*," points us to the period as above, viz., A. D. 666, when he should assume this particular feature of his Anti-Christian career. Our conclusion is, that this number, as some contend, cannot have a common commencement with

1. Dr. H. Moore.

2. Consult 1 Cor. xiii., xiv.

the 1260 years of Daniel and St. John : nor as others, because this particular form of the Papal Anti-Christ took its rise in the *sixth* century, that it is to continue to run a career of three times six, or eighteen centuries. Either of these conjectures introduce so much confusion in the department of prophetic Chronology, as to carry to every intelligent mind, the evidence of their own refutation.

Of these two Anti-Christian powers therefore, the facts as herein brought to view demonstrate, that there is a correspondence in their general characteristics, — in their name, — in their malicious and cruel work, — in the common object of their persecuting rage, and in the period assigned to each, for the commencement and termination of their respective career. Is it not reasonable therefore to conclude, that they *commence* and *end* their career *together*? True, the *marks* which evidence the period of the rise respectively of these two powers, may not at first sight exhibit them as exactly cotemporaneous. This however admitted ; as the “little horn” of Daniel vii., 8, and which is to be understood of the *Papal* persecution, was preceded by its preparatory elemental workings even in the days of the Apostle Paul ;¹ so of the “little horn” of Daniel viii., 8, 9, which denoted the existence of the *Mohamedan* imposture. And, as of their *commencement*, so of their *termination*. If we assign to both these powers, in accordance with the *end* of the period allotted to their prevalence respectively, a certified point of time, we are not to imagine a *total annihila-*

1. 2 Thess. ii., 7.

tion of their peculiar elements. For, as the anti-christian elements of the *Papal* power, preceded by some centuries, its existence in an embodied and tangible form; so, upon the termination of the period assigned to its existence in that form, (like "the beasts" in Daniel vii. 12, which, while "they had their dominion *taken away*," "their *lives were prolonged* for a season and a time,") it may *still exist* in the *union* of its elements with others, in the establishment of the *last* Anti-Christian Confederacy, which, according to the Apostle Paul, is *immediately to precede* the second advent.¹ And, what is true of the *Papal*, is true also of the *Mohamedan* power. Indeed, of this last power, its *final* extinction, as one of the severest persecuting agencies in the hand of Satan against the church, is fixed in prophecy² at an advance of at least 51 years beyond the termination of the 1260 years. Hence we remark, that while these two persecuting powers, the Papal and the Mohamedan, are principally brought to view in the visions of Daniel and St. John, there are two others to which we would allude; the one, the *Pagan*, the dread ordeal of trial to the Primitive Church; the other, the *Infidel*, a combination of the malign influences of the "three unclean spirits like frogs," which St. John saw "come out of the mouth of the *dragon*, and out of the mouth of the *beast*, and out of the mouth of the *false prophet*;"³ and who is to constitute the *last* ordeal of the Church's integrity.

1. 2 Thess. ii., 1—6.

2. Rev. ix., 14, 15.

3. Rev. xvi., 13.

In conclusion therefore on this subject we remark, that, corresponding with these several persecuting powers of the faithful of God in different ages, are first, the "*seven times*" of Daniel iv., 16, comprehending twice 1260 years,¹ and ending with it; and second, the 2300 years of Daniel viii., 14, which ends with the overthrow of the last Anti-Christ in 1847, and consequently includes ALL the persecuting Anti-Christian powers — the *Pagan*, the *Papal*, the *Mahometan*, and the *Infidel*.

Sufficient therefore, we think, has been said to show that "the time, times, and an half," or 1260 years of Daniel vii. 25, and xii. 7, commence and end together. We now remark, that with this number *synchronizes* THE WILDERNESS STATE OF THE CHURCH, as brought to view in the "thousand, two hundred, and three score days, or 1260 years of Rev. xii. 6, and the "Forty and two months," or 1260 years of Rev. xi. 2, and xiii. 5.

Now, as to the *date* of the *commencement* of the 1260 years, if we can fix upon the period of the rise of either of the two above named principle persecuting or anti-Christian powers, it will fully answer all the purposes of arriving at the important conclusion which is the object of our search. This, we think, we can find in the *period* of the rise of the PAPAL power. True, on this subject, different dates are assigned, by different interpreters. Bishop Newton fixes it at A.D. 727, at which time the Pope and people of Rome re-

1. See p. 229.

volted from the exarchal of Ravenna, and threw off their allegiance to the Greek Emperor. Fleming, in his Apocalyptical Key, adopts A.D. 606, as the time of its rise, assigning the reason, that in that year Phocas bestowed upon the Pope the title of Universal Bishop.

• The objection (which, with all due deference I submit) the objection to Bishop Newton's period is, that it is adopted with a view to accommodate the termination of the 1260 years as nearly as possible to the end of the last 2000 of the 6000th year of the world. "But the very circumstance of this being the case proves him to be in error; for at the year 2000, according to his own shewing, the millenium is to commence; consequently *prior* to that time all the prophecies relating to the subjugation of the true church, and the dominion of apostacy, must have ceased." Consequently, the 6th and 7th vials (Rev. xvi. 12 — 17) if poured out at all, that pouring out must take place *after* the commencement of the millennium, which supposition contravenes the general idea entertained of that state, which all consider to be exempt from the judgments of God. But we contend, and the Bishop virtually admits, that the 1260 years end with the pouring out of the fifth vial. The *influence* of the Beast (Papal) as the Bishop afterwards says, most probably will continue till the millennium, when he is to be miraculously "consumed with the spirit of the mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of the coming" ¹ of the Son of Man. This perfectly accords

1. 2 Thess. ii., 8.

with our view, that the *reign* of Popery (regal) will cease *before* the dogmas he has been instrumental in upholding as the *spiritual* anti-christ, will have been exterminated. As already shown, he existed before the 1260 years, though in a different character. Why may he not do so after?

Fleming's date of 606 is, in our view, a nearer approximation to the truth. But the edict of Phocas in that year, constituting the Pope universal Bishop, was but the confirmation of the *previous* act of Justinian, in A.D. 533,¹ when that Emperor, addressing John II., in an epistle, calls him "*the head of all the holy Churches, and states that he had made haste to subject and unite to the seat of his holiness (vestræ sanctitatis) ALL THE PRIESTS OF THE WHOLE EAST.*"²

To this we are aware it is objected, that "Anti-Christ had already risen;" that "neither John II. nor any of his immediate successors — Agapetus, Silverius, Vigilius, Pelagius, John III., Benedict, Pelagius II., Gregory, or Sabinianus, adopted the appellation, "Head of the Church." And that "one of these ten

1. This date is now adopted by all the most eminent interpreters of Prophecy — Bickersteth, Cunninghame, Freere, Irving, Keith, Habershon, and many others. Mr. Faber likewise adopted it in the *former* editions of his sacred calendar, and from him, indeed, Mr. Cunninghame first derived it. In a subsequent edition, however, it is excluded, and he has adopted in its stead, the period of the Gothic Kingdoms unanimously recognising the Papal supremacy. This he has done, to avoid "the conclusion (which was inevitable in his former editions) that the Second Advent of Christ is *Pre-Millennial*."

2. Code Lib. i. Tit. i., l. 8. Court of Rome, p. 6.

Bishops, Gregory the Great, protested against its usurpation by John, patriarch of Constantinople, pronounced him to be Anti-christ who should assume it, and that by way of contrast, called himself "*Servius Servorum Dei*." Yet these, and a thousand and one similar objections to the contrary notwithstanding, may all be accounted for by the *motive* of humility assumed by Gregory the Great, which evidently was, to "exhibit, by way of contrast, the arrogance of the Bishop of Constantinople," a formidable *rival* to his Holiness, who had taken to himself "the title of Universal, or Œcumenical Bishop." For, says the author of the *Histoire des Papes*, he (Gregory) did not, on that account, omit to take the care of the *universal church*. The reason he gave for not taking the *TITLE* of *universal* was, that it was (*un nom fastueux superbe*,) a proud name, and not suitable to Christian humility. Not that he did not *know and acknowledge truly* that the *POPES WERE CHIEFS AND SOVEREIGN PASTORS* of the *whole Catholic Church*. For himself showed, by several actions in this same year (595) that he was *the Bishop of the universal world*." ¹

Mr. Cunninghame, on the Apocalypse, 3rd edition, p. 256, in treating of this date, first lays down as a proposition, *that the commencement of the 1260 years is to be marked by the giving the saints, and times, and laws (of the Church) into the hands of the little horn*. And he next adopts the axiom of Mr. Faber, that the giving of the saints into the hands of the

1. Hist. des Papes, p. 339. Court of Rome, p. 6, 7.

Papacy, must be by some formal act of the *secular* power of the empire, constituting the *Pope* the **HEAD** of the Church." He then resolves that act into the above edict of Justinian, A. D, 533, who first issues a decree, demanding from his subjects the adoption of the principal article of his faith, which was, that the Virgin Mary was the *Mother* of God, (thus publicly avowing the principles of demonolatry) and that under the penalty of a confiscation of their property, and then submits this edict to the Pope, asking his sanction thereto, which was given in the following year. This was followed by the *invocation* of the Virgin Mary, in an edict addressed by Justinian to the Præfect of Africa, thus giving public evidence that the faith of the head of the empire was not only blasphemous but demonolatrous. Finally, all the *preceding* acts of Justinian for establishing a secular and ecclesiastical supremacy in the Church (including also a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, *in which the above titles were likewise given to the Pope,*) were inserted in the volume of the Civil Law, published by Justinian, which became the basis of the jurisprudence of all the kingdoms of the western empire; and Mr. Cunninghame, in his critical examination of Faber, page 90, states also that the previous edicts of Gratian and Valentinian the III., on which Mr. Faber and others lay great emphasis, *are not to be found in that volume*; a distinction which he thinks of a very prominent character between the two former edicts and that of Justinian, as to their becoming the settled and ~~ultimate~~ *ultimate* law of the empire. And although

Comber, in his "Forgeries of the Councils," p. 251, offers some plausible reasons against the *probability* of the above acts of Justinian, yet that he really did consider the Pope *pre-eminent*, is evident from the fact that he identified the letters to the Pope with the civil law, and embodied his primacy in that law; in confirmation of which Gibbon says, "the vain titles of the victories of Justinian are crumbled in the dust; but the name of the legislator is inscribed on a fair and everlasting monument. Under his name, and by his care, the civil jurisprudence was digested in the immortal works of the CODE, the PANDECTS, and the INSTITUTIONS—the public reasons of the Romans has been silently or studiously transfused into THE DOMESTIC INSTITUTIONS OF EUROPE. and the laws of Justinian still command the respect or obedience of independent nations."¹ "The novels" of Justinian "are full of directions about ecclesiastical matters, and the primacy over the Christian Church, through the Roman Empire, is given to the Pope in the body of them;" and "there are other expressions in Justinian's novels, making the Pope pre-eminent, to which Comber has not alluded. (Nov. 131, ch. 2.) "Sancimus sanctissimum senioris Romæ Papam PRIMUM ESSE OMNIUM SACERDOTUM."²

The history, then, of the rise of the Papal Ante-

1. See Encyclo. Brit. on "Law."

2. See on this subject, Brook's Elements of Proph. Interpretation pp. 335—338. Also, Biskersteth's Guide, &c., pp. 140, 141.

christ we would sum up as follows: This "man of sin and son of perdition" was *conceived* in the age of the apostles and the primitive church, from A. D. 34 to 553, at which time he was *born*. Thence to the period of his *adolescence* in A. D. 606; thence to his *virility* or *manhood*, in A. D. 666; at which time, having planted himself firmly in his anti-christian seat, he prosecuted with more vigorous and unrelenting fury the already begun work of "speaking great words against the Most High—of wearing out the saints of the Most High—of changing times and laws," &c.¹

But the career of his malice and rage against the saints was *limited*. The time was *set* "when he should have *accomplished* to scatter the power of the holy people." He was only to "consume and destroy it unto the *end*."² That end *arrived*, "the *judgment* was to sit, and his *DOMINION* was to be *taken away*."³ Yes, the little horn "of Daniel vii., 8, was to wear out the saints of the Most High, and to prevail against them, UNTIL the ancient of days came," at which time "judgment was to be given *to the saints* of the Most High, when *they* should possess the kingdom."⁴

The *limits* of this dominion, according to Daniel, and with which, as we have shown, synchronizes the duration of the wilderness state of the Church as described by St. John, is fixed at 1260 years.

Now, if, at the expiration of the 1260 years from

1. Dan. vii., 25.

2. Dan. xii., 7; vii., 26.

3. Dan. vii., 26.

4. Dan. vii., 21, 22.

A. D., 533, history is marked by any event corresponding in magnitude with the taking away of the power of the Papal Antichrist, all conjecture, as to the *birth* of this power, viz., A. D., 533, must give place to certainty.

This then, we affirm, is true of A. D. 1793.

To place this subject, in connexion with our preceding remarks respecting the persecuting powers of the Church in a still clearer light, we remark, that, "during the Old Testament dispensation, the people of God wore a strictly *national* aspect." So with their persecutors. "First they were the *Egyptians*, then the *Assyrians*, then the *Babylonians*, then the *Persians*, and subsequently the *Romans*. But among them BABYLON was pre-eminent: ¹ so much so, as to give a general name to the whole persecuting power."

But, as under the Old, so under the New Testament dispensation: "the people of God wore a two-fold aspect, *national* and *spiritual*,—national as regards their *outward* privileges, spiritual, as regards their *religious* character." So, "the great oppressor, the persecutor, the successful opponent of the people of God:" the Scriptures presenting him to our view in a double aspect, viz., "national and *anti-spiritual*,—national, in opposition to their outward privileges, to their properties, and to their LIVES; and anti-spiritual, in her deadly hostility to THE TRUTH, the life and soul of the Church of God."

The question now presents itself,—whither are we

1. Dan. ii. 31—38.

to look for the existence, in their perfection, of these hostile machinations, against the outward privileges and spiritual truth of God's people? As "the language, applied to the *literal* Israel, continues applicable to that nation, still beloved for the Father's sake, and at the same time becomes transferable to the *spiritual* Israel;" So "the language of the Old Testament, also, applied to the *literal* Babylon, furnished a mode of speech which was adopted by the Apostles under the new, to set forth the anti-spiritual oppressors of the people of God under the *present* dispensation: so that the language applied to the *literal* Babylon is now transferrable to the Romish system, wherever found. This fact may be confirmed by a single illustration,—that, for instance, which relates to the destruction of HUMAN LIFE of "the Saints of the Most High," at the hand of the little papal horn of Daniel. "Joseph Mede reckons up 1,200,000 of the Waldenses and Albigenses put to death in 30 years. It is calculated, that the Roman Catholics, since the rise of the persecution in the 7th or 8th century, to the present time, have butchered, in their blind and diabolical zeal for the Church, no less than 50,000,000 of those they term *heretics*. Since the Spaniards set foot on the shores of America, it is calculated they have butchered 12,000,000 on the Continent, besides the many millions who fell in the islands." ¹ "Lorentes calculates that the inquisition in the Spanish peninsula alone, under the uninterrupted dominion of 45 grand inquisitors, have sacrificed 241,000 individuals."

1. Simpson's Plea, p. 195.

"Popery must bear the blame of this ; for the Pope, by virtue of his blasphemous title as God's vicar and vicegerent, gave Philip of Spain all those countries, and his blood-thirsty soldiers first took possession of them in the *Pope's* name, and then proceeded to extirpate the inhabitants."¹

This, we say, was the *virus* (the venom) of the ancient "Babylonish system : but the *perfection* of that system is found especially at Rome ; and therefore, we find this persecutor of the people of God, set forth under the New Testament, by the *name* of Babylon, and by the *description* of a city standing on seven hills, which is a description of Rome, as the mystic "BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."²

"Curs'd System, bitter root of every crime,
Of sin the ugliest, foulest incarnation ;
The darkest *blood-shot* on the face of time,
Sure source of ruin unto many a nation :
The bane of peace, the hind'rer of Salvation,
The severer of every tender tie ;
Fountain of broken hearts, true imitation
Of Satan's regal power and dignity."

In addition, "a few facts recalled to mind, will show that these heavy charges are not without foundation. Look at its image worship, and other hundred senseless, mischievous mummeries, both for the dead and the living. Think how it takes away the book of life,

1. Thoughts on the Com. and King of Chris.. by John Cox, p. 29.

2. Rev. v. 17.

the lamp of eternity. Consider how it exalts saints and angels, and degrades the Redeemer !”

“But we are told that popery is changed, and that these things should not *now* be mentioned ; but because I believe it is *unchanged* and *unchangeable*, I have hinted at these things. I believe popery as a system, to be like sin ; both may, yea, both shall be annihilated, but *neither* can be changed ; while they live, they will retain their nature, and restlessly follow up their grand object, which in both is, DOMINION.”

The strength of the papal dominion may be inferred from the fact, that in A. D. 1793, France alone contained upwards of 366,000 secular and regular clergy, besides an immense number of nuns. In the whole of Christendom, there were no less than 255,444 monasteries about 150 years ago.

The period however had ultimately arrived, when this Anti-christian dominion was to receive an *intimation*, (a sign,) of its long-predicted doom. Besides numerous other premonitions of this, which our limits necessarily exclude, that of Henry VIII and his successors in England, in suppressing 3180 monasteries, containing a population of 50,000 persons, may serve as an example. But it was *at the fall of the French monarchy*, on the 10th of August, 1792, that a series of the most stupendous events *began* their awful course, which so exactly correspond in character with the results to be expected from the judgement of the Ancient of Days upon the Papal power, that we are led, reasoning from these events, to fix on the following year, A. D. 1793, when that Hierarchy *was shak-*

en to its centre by the apocalyptic earthquake, as the ERA of the commencement of that Judgment, a description of which is given in Daniel vii. 9—11. It is as follows :

“I beheld till the thrones were cast down (or *set*) and the Ancient of Days did sit. A fiery stream came forth from before him, thousand thousands ministered unto him—and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him—the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake, I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.”

Before considering the import of these words, let it be observed, that the verse which follows, namely, the 12th, is a parenthesis, and simply informs us, that when the *three former Beasts* were deprived of their dominion, it was not effected by a destruction similar to that of the *fourth Beast*, but their lives (that is, the *political* existence of the nations of which they consisted) were prolonged for a season. As to the fulfilment of this, history testifies to it. Indeed, the nations inhabiting the territories of the former three Beasts, continue in existence even to the present day, although in a feeble state, and now fast wasting away.

The *Judgement of the ANCIENT OF DAYS* is an emblematical representation of that special act of the FATHER, which is signified in the words of the 110th

Psalm: *Sit thou at my right hand until I MAKE THY FOES THY FOOTSTOOL.* It is manifest from the last clause that there is to be an *acting* or *putting forth* of the power of the ALMIGHTY FATHER in making the enemies of Christ his footstool. The ANCIENT OF DAYS, or the ETERNAL FATHER, is here represented, therefore, as COMING, (for the *Horn* prevailed against the saints *until the Ancient of days CAME*,¹) and sitting down with his joint assessors (the imagery being taken, as Mede observes, from the session of the Jewish Sanhedrim) on the throne of Judgment. The *fourth Beast*, and his *lawless Horn*, are summoned to the bar and condemned, and the execution of the judgment is begun.

Now, seeing that the ETERNAL FATHER, is essentially *invisible* to mortal eyes, and *no man hath seen Him, or can see Him*;² it is necessarily implied in the foregoing description of the Judgment of the *Ancient of Days*, that it is conducted by an agency which is altogether *invisible* and can be discerned only by the eye of Faith.

Its effects, however, must be awful and universal as it respects the territories of the fourth Beast of Daniel, and must bring in a train of calamities of the most fearful and unequalled extent. Turning now to the history of Europe for the last forty-one years, we find, that during that period, every European kingdom has been shaken to its foundations. The throne of France, its central kingdom, has been overthrown five

1. Dan. vii., 22.

2. 1 Tim. vi., 16.

times,¹ besides numerous minor changes. The thrones of the greater part of the other European Kingdoms have been twice subverted.² Every part of Continental Europe has been drenched with blood in a series of wars, wherein millions of the human race have fallen by the sword and disease.

Every Capital of the European Kingdoms of the Continent, from Moscow to Lisbon, has, in the same period, been occupied by foreign armies.

In the greater part of Europe, the property of the Church of Rome has been seized for secular purposes. *The PAPAL DOMINION has also been shaken to its foundation, and its power to persecute the Saints taken away.* It is true, that it is now using every effort to obtain proselytes, and with such success as justly to alarm the true disciples of the Lord — but it is obliged to trust to the power of *persuasion* only, and is deprived throughout Europe of the power of the temporal sword, which was formerly wielded in its behalf. The destruction of the Papal Power is proceeding even in the States of America, which profess the Romish faith. In the year 1825, an important State Paper was issued by the Congress of Mexico, renouncing the authority of Rome to interfere in secular and political affairs; and in the Republic

1. 1st. Overthrow, that of Louis XVI. in 1792. 2d. Bonaparte in 1814. 3d. Louis XVIII. in 1815. 4th. Bonaparte in 1815. 5th. Charles X. in 1830.

2. 1st. At the overthrow of the ancient Dynasties; and 2dly. When the vassal Kings of Bonaparte shared the same fate.

of Colombia the public exercise of the Protestant worship has within the last two years been permitted. It was before prohibited.

During the whole of the above period of forty-one years, Europe has been in a continued state of revolutionary excitement, nor has it enjoyed, even within the last seventeen years of peace, so much as *one year of solid tranquillity*, free from the alarms of the political volcano which has ever and anon been manifesting the signs of new eruptions.

In the British kingdoms, by the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill, in the year 1829, and the Reform Bill in 1832, there was effected within the short space of little more than three years, an entire revolution, whereby its Political and Ecclesiastical Constitution has been changed, its House of Peers degraded as an independent branch of the Legislature, its Aristocracy deprived of its power, which has been transferred to the people, and its monarchy left as a naked column without support.¹ This country, though exempted from the miseries of foreign invasion, has been most severely visited by commercial, and manufacturing, and agricultural distress, at different intervals, which have reduced the poorer classes from comparative comfort to misery.

It may be added, that all Europe is now trembling

1. It will be understood, that this is merely a narrative of the late changes, without any opinion, whether they are for better or worse. That their effects, as here stated, are not magnified, might easily be shown, were there space for it.

and heaving with the expectation of some mighty crisis, so that no words can fitly express its present condition; but those of our Lord himself, who thus describes the same series of events, which have been detailed in the preceding pages, as the results of the sitting of the Judgment of the Ancient of Days." ¹

This Judgment of the Ancient of Days on the *Papal* Anti-Christ still holds its righteous session over that dread power. But, in addition to its former national and *Anti-Spiritual* Characteristics as the great persecuting power of the Church, (the generality of commentators admitting that *popery*, in its combined political and ecclesiastical forms are represented by the beast from the sea and the beast from the earth of Rev. xiii., and by the harlot of chapter xvii.,) "there is *another* Anti-Christian power in existence, whose career is *subsequent* to the reign of the harlot; and the *first* of whose acts," upon the attainment of sufficient power, "like a true wild beast, is to turn and *rend* her, with whom he has been, *under a former aspect*, in alliance." — I mean the beast from the bottomless pit. This power will be Popery INFIDELIZED, wielding over the nations the sceptre of despotism! ²

Having then demonstrated, page 233 that the 1260, the 1290, and the 1335 years of Daniel xii. have a *common commencement*; also, that the 1260 years terminated in A. D. 1793, as the time of the com-

1. Cunninghame's Polit. Dest. of the Earth, p. 29—31.

2. See Rev. xvi., 12—14.

mencement of the Judgment upon the Papal beast by the ancient of Days; there remains an excess of 30 years of the 1290 over the 1260, and of 45 years of the 1335 over the 1290.

Now, as the 1260 years refers to the duration of the Papal dominion in its consolidated form, and 1793 marks the period of the commencement of its overthrow; so, counting the 1335 years from A. D. 533, it brings us down to A. D. 1868, the time of the commencement of millennial blessedness as portrayed by Daniel xii., 12, 13; as the period of consummated ruin to the confederated Papal, Infidel, and despotic Anti-Christian power. But, this intervening 75 years from A. D. 1793 to A. D. 1868, being divided, as above, into *two* periods of 30 and 45 years, the first term of 30 years terminated A. D. 1822, which was signalized by the following remarkable events, viz., — the declaration of independence by the Greeks, and their consequent separation from Turkey, which resulted in the restoration of the seat of the *third* empire to political power; the pouring out of the *sixth* vial, and the preaching of the second advent. The second term of 45 years is that interval during which the great “day of the Lord,” the day of “the end,” is signalized by “the breaking up of the visible gentile kingdoms and Churches, (Rev. xvi., 19,) on account of their apostacy and wickedness, by a series of desolating judgments foretold distinctly in Dan. ii., 34, 35,” and in the seven apocalyptic thunders, (Rev. x., 1 — 4) which St. John was commanded to “seal up.” Both in Daniel and St. John, these and similar

predictions are explicitly interpreted by the angel as pointing out CHRIST'S *kingdom breaking in pieces* all the previous *kingdoms, and which will stand forever.*

Here, then, is the complete overthrow of **POPERY, MAHOMEDANISM, INFIDELITY, and EVERY** opposing kingdom. This is *the time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation to this time; NO, NOR EVER SHALL BE.* Heaven *prepare* us for, and *preserve* us during our exposure to, the days of calamity which await us!

In conclusion,

| | A. M. | A. D. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 1. Put down from Creation and Fall to the commencement of Daniel's 70 prophetic weeks.... | 3679 | |
| 2. Commencement of Daniel's 70 weeks to the Nativity | 453 | |
| 3. From the Nativity to the commencement of the 1260 years | | 533 |
| 4. The 1260 years | | 1260 |
| 5. Excess of 1290 years over the above..... | | 30 |
| 6. Excess of 1335 over 1290 | | 45 |
| From the <i>Creation</i> to the <i>Nativity</i> | 4132 | 1868 |
| From the <i>Nativity</i> to the <i>end of time</i> | 1868 | |
| Total | 6000 | |

"The Signs of the Times," as delineated in the following Lecture, will, we think, be found to *confirm* the above chronology.

LECTURE II.

"SIGNS OF THE TIMES," &c.

MATT. XVI., 23.

"O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

HABAK. ii., 3.

"The vision is yet for an appointed time; but at the end it shall speak, and not lie; though it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come; it will not tarry."

LUKE xxi., 28.

"And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh."

These three passages taken together, form the ground work of our present Lecture. The first asserts the existence of "signs," as applicable to "times and seasons" *generally*; in other words, that there is a perfect analogy between the *physical* effects consequent upon the mutations of the heavenly bodies in producing incessant fluctuations from "fair weather" to "foul;" and those *moral* effects which are the result

of God's providences, and which, in the collect for fourth Sunday after Easter, are significantly styled "the sundry and manifold changes of the world." The second passage is designed to teach us that there are *limits* set to the long period of concealment of the prophetic word, and that the time is designated when that period of concealment should terminate; viz., "*at the end.*" And the third passage directs our thoughts to a consideration of "SIGNS," which, in *addition* to DATES, as brought to view in the preceding Lecture, are designed to indicate "THE TIME" of "the end."

Nor let any suppose, that we are conducting them into a field of wild conjecture, or of idle speculation; for, of those constantly recurring signs in the *physical* world, the lover of nature may sing,

" Not till the freezing blast is still,
Till freely leaps the sparkling rill,
And gales sweep soft from summer skies,
As o'er a sleeping infant's eyes
A mother's kiss; e'er calls like these,
No sunny gleam awakes the trees,
Nor dare the tender flow'rets show
Their bosoms to th' uncertain glow."

Nor less certainly may the truly contemplative lover of God's eternal truth, as it is unfolded by "signs" in the *moral* world, sing,

" Not surer does each tender gem,
Set in the fig-tree's polished stem,
Foreshow the summer season bland,
Than these DREAD SIGNS—thy mighty hand!"

Yes, of "the Church of the living God," which his word declares is "the pillar and ground of the truth," the existence of a *general defection* from the truth to the contrary notwithstanding, it may be said,

"She has a charm, a word of fire.
A pledge of love that cannot tire;
By tempests, earthquakes, and by wars,
By rushing waves and falling stars,
By EVERY SIGN her Lord foretold,
She sees the world is waxing *old*;
And, through that last and direst storm,
Descries *by faith* her SAVIOR'S FORM."

These and the like considerations lead us to perceive with what force and power our Lord must have charged home upon the Pharisees and Sadducees of his day, the appropriate epithet of "hypocrite!" "Ye *can discern* the face of the *sky*," says he: why not then with equal clearness, "*discern the signs of the times?*" as though he said, both are *equally* marked by their appropriate characteristics—both, therefore, are *equally intelligible*. "When it is evening, ye say, It will be *fair* weather, for the sky is *red*—and in the morning, It will be *foul* weather to-day, for the sky is *red* and *lowring*"—But, "*The Times*" are characterized by "Signs" even of paramount significance. "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." ¹ Why then pretend ignorance of the lessons

1. Matt. xi., 5.

of instruction imparted by the one, any more than the other? It is sheer, base hypocrisy! Brethren, my prayer is,—may God avert from us this tremendous charge!

But, in order to this, we must avoid the sin of that presumptuous, heaven-daring Infidelity, which refuses to receive the truth of God, unless attested by *redundant* evidence. This, as it was the fatal error, so it was the heinous sin, of the ancient Pharisees and Sadducees, who, tempting Christ, desired him that he would show them a *Sign* from heaven; “whereas Christ uniformly taught that the works (miracles) which he did in his Father’s name,” as “the Signs of the times,” in unison with all that the Prophets had spoken concerning him, bore ample testimony to the truth of his Messiahship, which Messiahship, or the Deity veiled in human flesh, constituted the foundation of all the moral phenomena peculiar to that age.

Nor is this all. We, “upon whom the ends of the world are come,” are admonished by the errors of the most eminent saints in these premises in all ages, to guard most sedulously against incredulity on the one hand, and idle curiosity on the other. Of *incredulity*, as it respects the *faithfulness* and *power* of God, in the accomplishment of ALL that he hath spoken; as illustrated in the conduct of Abraham, who, when God said to him, “I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give *thee* this land to inherit it,” i. e., the land of Canaan, replied, “Lord God,

whereby shall I *know* that *I* shall inherit it?" Also in the conduct of Sarah, whose scornful laugh at the promise of a son in her old age, though she vainly attempted to conceal it, betrayed the presiding conviction of her mind that the "thing" was "*too hard* for the Lord."¹ Of *idle curiosity*, as seen in the prying inquisitiveness into the *veiled mysteries* of God, of the Midian shepherd, Moses, when his eye, being attracted by the brilliancy of the burning but unconsumed bush, said, "I will now *turn aside* and see this great sight, *why* the bush is not burnt."² These, with other and similar instances which might be adduced in illustration of the above, we say, were *errors* of the great and good : and though not damnable, yet furnish occasions for admonition and rebuke.

But, incredulity in the faithfulness and power of God to perform all that he hath spoken ; and idle curiosity respecting His veiled mysteries, constitute, pre-eminently, the *errors*,—as a Pharisaical infidelity does the *sin*, of this remarkable age. While, as in primitive times, this adulterous generation, when addressed upon the *general* truths of the Gospel, demand, as a *condition* of their belief, "a sign from *heaven*,"³ or that "one arise from the *dead* ;"⁴ the great body of those "who profess and call themselves Christians," either betray a disposition to tread upon ground where angels dare not venture, or, when addressed upon the

1. Gen. xv. 7, 8.

3. Exod. iii. 1—3.

2. Gen. xviii, 10—15

4. Matt. xvi, 1.

subject of those events which are *now* transpiring, or which are *about* to transpire on the present theatre of time, ask, "*How can these things be?*"¹ For instance—When we speak of the final drying up of the mystic Euphrates, or the total extinction of the Ottoman Empire, as *soon* to take place.—When we advert to the appearance of "the Man of Sin, the son of perdition"² who, as a real person, is to head the last and greatest antichristian confederacy, as *soon* to be revealed—When we speak of the restoration, after a long and painful exile, of the Jewish nation to the promised land of their fathers,³ as *nigh at hand*—Finally, and above all, when we call the attention to the second, personal, pre-millennial, glorious advent of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,⁴ accompanied by his risen and glorified saints,⁵ upon the *completion* of the Jewish restoration; and that for the express purpose of "dashing to pieces like a potter's vessel"⁶ *their*, and *our*, and *his* enemies, and to set up his "tabernacle among men"⁷ by the establishment of that "kingdom which is to break down and destroy all others, and which is to stand forever;"—⁸ I say, when these and the like truths, as we receive them, and honestly believe to be taught in the word of God, are addressed to their understanding, professors of religion "with one consent,"⁹ and almost *en masse*, rise up and charge us with bringing "strange things to their ears."⁹

1. John iii. 9.

3. Ezek. xxxviii. 14—28.

5. 1 Thess. iv. 15—18.

7. Rev. xxi. 3.

2. 2 Thess. ii. 3.

4. Acts i. 10, 11.

6. Isa. xxx. 14.

8. Dan. ii. 44.

9. Acts xvii. 20.

In order, therefore, to disabuse the minds of Christians of an error, the practical tendency of which, in the study of the prophecies whether of the Old or New Testament, tends to prove so highly derogatory to the honor and glory of the God of the prophets, by perverting, yea, defeating the very ends for which the predictions as uttered by them respectively were designed, we deem it important not only, but essential to a proper understanding of the subject, that we here institute a distinction between prophecy and the "signs" which accompany them.

"To *prophecy*, is to look forward and tell the events of years to *come*, even as *history* tells the events of years that are *past*." ¹ Hence history is the interpreter of prophecy.

"*Signs*" are the *harbingers* of events pointed out by prophecy.

Our next remark is, that to *predict* future events, and to *define* the signs which are to indicate their fulfilment, is the exclusive province of the Almighty. He ALONE "knows the end from the beginning."

"Signs," we observe further, are designed to herald the fulfilment of predicted events as *near at hand*. This point we shall illustrate as we advance. We now ask, *why* this arrangement of "SIGNS" as the precursors of future events, with the predictions which announce them? Are they to be looked upon as an unmeaning ordinance of heaven? Then the Almighty is trifling with his creatures. Nay, I venture to affirm

1. McNeil's Second Advent, p. 49.

that there is not one in this intelligent assembly to-night, who, when pointed to any one of the *fulfilled* prophecies connected with which was a "sign," as a prelude of its accomplishment, would not consider it an insult to his understanding if called upon to close his eyes against it. Tell such an one that the "sign" means nothing, and he will tell you, and rightly too, that the *prediction* means nothing.

This result, however, contemplates the subject in its direct and individual application to the heart and conscience in the sight of God, and it relates to a *single* fulfilled prediction, and its accompanying sign or signs. The point whence arises hesitancy, doubt, and unbelief in these premises is, when you spread out the great chart of *unfulfilled prophecy as a whole*, marking out what portions are now in course of fulfilment, and what that yet remains to be fulfilled, as indicated by their respective sign or signs. Yet it is at this point that it is objected, both in verbal and in written forms, that prophecy, singly or collectively, can in *no sense* be understood, until the event or events comprehended therein *verify their import* by their *accomplishment*.

Now, in furnishing a reply to this objection, it will be serviceable to state,

1. That every prediction comprehends within itself the double characteristic of *judgment* and of *mercy*. Of judgment, for the contemnors of God's law; of mercy, for those who delight in its observance. Hence,

2. Corresponding with this truth is the fact, that every prediction proclaims alike to all, a *warning* and

a *promise*. A warning to the rebellious — a promise to the obedient.

To illustrate these points. The voice of prophecy proclaimed to Noah, and through him to the apostate antediluvians, God's purpose to destroy all flesh from off the face of the earth by the flood.¹ The same voice of prophecy pointed out the overthrow of the five rebellious cities of the plain in the time of Abraham and Lot.² Also, of the 430 years "sojourning" of the Israelites in Egypt, and of their bondage during this period to that people.³ Also, of the 70 years captivity of Judah,⁴ &c.

We now ask, were all those interested in the events set forth in these predictions, subjected to the annoyance and perplexity of vague conjecture either as to the *time* or *circumstances* of their accomplishment? In other words, were they *totally ignorant* of their import till verified by the fulfilment of the events of which they spake? Nay, verily, the *warning voice* of 120 years,⁵ reiterated the approaching judgments of God on the "old world,"⁶ the inhabitants of which unheeding, "perished;"⁷ while, "by faith" in the *promised preservation* of himself and family,⁸ "Noah, being warned of God of things not yet seen, moved with fear, prepared an ark for the saving of his house, by which he condemned the world, and became heir

1. Gen. vi. 17.

3. Gen. xv., 14

5. Gen. vi. 3.

7. Gen. vii. 22, 23.

24*

2. Gen. xvii.

4. Jer. xxv., 12.

6. 2 Pet. ii. 5.

8. Gen. vi. 13—22.

of the righteousness which is by faith." ¹ Respecting the destruction of the cities of the plain, saith God "Shall I *hide* from *Abraham* that thing which I do." ² So far from this, the voice of warning is proclaimed also in the ears of *Lot*, the only righteous inhabitant within the walls of *Sodom*; ³ and, warned thus himself, he flees in haste "to his sons-in-law, which married his daughters, and said, up, get ye out of this place; for the Lord will destroy this city! But he seemed as one that mocked his sons-in-law." ⁴ With the predicted affliction of the Israelites in Egypt was connected the threatened judgment of God upon the nation whom they should serve not only, but the period of its endurance was specified—430 years. ⁵ The parents of *Moses* (who were of the tribe of *Levi*, which tribe was devoted to the services of the temple, ⁶ and who "were not afraid of the king's commandment," ⁷ that "every [*Hebrew*] son that was born should be cast into the river," ⁸) having "hid him three months, because they saw he was a *proper* child," (i. e. "goodly" ⁹—"fair to God." ¹⁰) And God having meted out to them the due reward of their faith by the restoration of their infant son from the brink of a watery grave at the hands of the king's daughter; as he advanced to manhood, imparted to him that instruction respect-

1. Heb. xi., 7.

2. Gen. xviii 17—21..

3. Gen. xix., 12.

4. Gen. xix. 14.

5. Gen. xv., 13—17.

6. Num. iii., 5—13.

7. Exod. i., 22.

8. Exod. ii., 2.

9. Exod. ii, 2.

10. Acts. vii., 20.

in the predicted bondage of his brethren, and their promised deliverance from the hand of their oppressors, which they had sedulously preserved in their own remembrance. As evidence of this fact, and that Moses had a perfect understanding of this prophecy *before* it was fulfilled, and of the part that he was to act as God's agent in its accomplishment, appears from the lesson which he supposed his brethren would have inferred from this avenging the wrongs of an injured brother, by slaying its author : and that was, that "*by his hand* God would *deliver* them. But they understood not." ¹ So of the 70 years' predicted captivity of Judah. It commenced in *judgment* : it ended in *mercy*. The apostacy of Judah, against which they had long been warned by the prophetic voice, had culminated in a long and painful exile from their own land and kingdom, in which exile many of the pious and faithful were participants. Of this number Daniel was one. But, while judgment was executing its work on the apostate, mercy supported the otherwise sinking spirits of the faithful, by holding up to their view the heart-cheering promise of their restoration at a *limited* period. "When 70 years are accomplished, saith the Lord, I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations." ² Accordingly it is written, "In the first year of Darius, I Daniel, *understood by books* the number of years whereof the word of the Lord came to

1. Acts vii., 25.

2. Jer. xxv., 12.

Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem." ¹

And now, Daniel, thus faithful in watching for the consummation of the 70 years captivity, is himself endowed with the prophetic Spirit. Then too, more *ample scope* is given to his discernment of the *future*, and the 70 *years* of Jeremiah is succeeded by another and a distinct revelation to Daniel, stretching through the longer period of 70 *weeks* of years. This period, as shown in our former Lecture, was divided into three unequal parts, the last division of which, consisting of one or the last of the 70 prophetic weeks, was to be signalized by the confirmation of the covenant with many, and in the midst of which, "Messiah" was to be "cut off."

Of one event, however, and that a most prominent one, as comprehended in the prophetic series of Daniel's 70 weeks, the student of prophecy was left to stand on *uncertain* ground as to time. I now speak of the period of the *Nativity*. The pious Jew, casting his eye over the prophetic word, *could* tell when the Messiah that was to come, should be "cut off," &c., commencing his reckoning of the whole period of the 70 weeks from the command to restore and build Jerusalem. But the specific *age* of the Immaculate sufferer at the time of his crucifixion was not revealed. The *time* of Christ's NATIVITY therefore was left to *conjecture*. Still there was *one* circumstance upon which the patient-waiting and praying expectants of the First

1. Dan. ix., 2.

advent of the Redeemer could rely with no small degree of safety. That was, the period of life at which commenced the exercise of the sacerdotal functions by the Aaronic priesthood, which varied from 25 to 30 years.¹ By deducting, say, the 30 years therefore, from the *middle* of the last prophetic week, it was sufficient to place them on the watch-tower, in their expectations of the appearance of Him whom they knew was to be "a HIGH-PRIEST of good things to come,"² on the ground that, as "every High-Priest" under the law was "ordained to offer gifts and *sacrifices*, it was of *necessity* that *this MAN* have *something* also to *offer*."³

In order therefore to inscribe this sentiment the more indelibly upon the mind, and keeping in view the great, the all-pervading principle of Analogy by way of a further illustration of the last named prophecy, and of the principle for which we are contending, allow me once more to remark, that, in the dispensations of God to man both in the natural and moral world, portentous events have been and are, ordinarily accompanied with corresponding premonitory signs of their approach. The noiseless collecting together of the lowering clouds and the blackness of the heavens, awaken within the breast the dread apprehension of some fearful convulsion of nature. The experienced mariner looks upon the temporary repose of sleeping billows as an unfailing

1. Compare Num. iv., 3, with viii., 24.

2. Heb. ix., 11.

3. Heb. viii., 3.

prelude to a gathering storm. Long continued submission to the oppressions of despotic power, admonish those who "bear rule," to anticipate with certainty the ultimate and more fearful desolations of political ruptures. And in the moral world, the death-like calm which accompanies the long protracted reign of ignorance and vice over the heart and conscience, may be relied upon as the infallible precursor of some eventful change. Thus, we say, it was, in reference,

I. TO THE FIRST ADVENT OF MESSIAH; to a consideration of which, in connexion with the preceding, we now invite your attention. The Chapter of the world's history in a *moral* sense, receives from this period the evidence, that, till now, it had been comparatively virtuous. In defiance of the otherwise salutary influence of civilization and refinement, the mighty republic of Rome, a little previous to the FIRST ADVENT of Jesus Christ, was overwhelmed with the grossest ignorance, the most degrading superstitions, the most bestial idolatry, and the most debasing and horrid crimes. A stupid and licentious paganism sat brooding over the entire civilized world, and all, except a few of the devout remnant of Israel, seemed pleased with the delusive fetters which bound them. And though in Ancient Greece and Rome, learning and the arts attained to the zenith of their glory, and the various systems of philosophy had the advantages of improvements by rejecting some of the grossest and most palpable errors of the past, yet all attempts at reformation among the commonalty proved abortive.

And then, in addition to this, the *civil* aspect of the world presented a state of things to human view the most astonishing. The political atmosphere of the far spreading heavens had retired to repose. The clash of arms and the din of war had ceased. Rome, the proud Empress of the civilized nations, distributed without partiality, the boon of social intercourse to the tributary provinces, which, together with that mighty empire, basked in the sunshine of peace and prosperity. The voice of prophecy had ceased. The Shechinah, or manifestation of the divine glory, remained no longer curtained beneath the spreading wings of the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies. "The lively oracles of God," though possessed by the Jews, by misinterpretations founded upon "the traditions of the elders," lost all their force and power; while their morals as a nation were as corrupted and debased, as were those of the licentious heathen. These then, were among the most *portentous signs of the times*, which *immediately preceded* the "MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN THE FLESH:" And, to a reflecting mind, guided by the light of revelation, they were calculated to inspire fresh hopes of the *near approach* of the Prince Messiah. They intimated to such, in a manner not to be misunderstood, the *necessity* of the appearance of such a divine personage, who alone could bring "*life and immortality to light*." This however, was not the common expectation. All were standing aghast as it were, waiting in breathless anxiety for the occurrence of some mighty revolution among the nations of the earth, the nature of which

however, they did not understand. True, the *Jews* had their eyes directed to the fulfilment of what the prophets had spoken in reference to their Messiah, but being in a great measure ignorant of their true import, they united with the fastidious and superstitious Roman, in consulting "the authority of the Sibylline books," and in trusting to "the decision of the sacred college of Etrurian augurs," by which they unanimously concluded, "that this momentous event was at hand. This was equally the case in the East. At that time the Emperor of India, uneasy at these prophecies, which, he conceived, portended his ruin and the loss of his empire, sent emissaries to inquire whether such a child were really born, in order to destroy him."

What different emotions however, filled the minds of those who, from the same important events, were looking for spiritual redemption in Israel? Yes: when they saw "these things begin to come to pass," they "looked up — they "lifted up their heads" which, from the moral darkness and desolations which every where prevailed, had been long hanging downward like the bulrush; for, they saw that their "redemption was drawing nigh." "The fulness of time," when "the *Son of God*," "the *seed of the woman*," "to whom all the prophets gave witness, Should appear, was beginning to *dawn* upon this guilty world. And, among the number of this remnant band of Jewish worthies in Jerusalem, was the aged Simeon. He "was a just man and devout." He had long been "*waiting* for the consolation of Israel."

"And to him it was revealed by the Holy Ghost, that he *should not see death*, before he had seen the LORD'S CHRIST."

Thus much in reference to those events which, as the "signs of the times," preceded the FIRST ADVENT of the Son of God.

At this point of our advance, therefore, we would remark, that the preceding facts, if they have any meaning, certainly demonstrate the error of those who affirm that no unfulfilled prophecy can be understood till the event to which it refers transpires. Else, what had become of Noah and his family? What of Abraham and of Lot? What of the millions of the enslaved Hebrews in Egypt? What of the pious and faithful captives of Babylon? What of the aged and devout Simeon, and those who with him had so long been "looking for redemption in Jerusalem?"¹ Alas, all must have been cut off from the inheritance of those *mercies* promised to the faithful of God in all ages, consequent upon a neglect to study prophetic "times and seasons" on the one hand, and in closing their eyes upon "the signs of the times" on the other. For, as you may perceive, the prophecies to which we have just adverted partook almost without exception, of both these characteristics. Was the commencement and termination of the predicted destruction of the ante-diluvian world limited to 120 years? The raising of every hand, the hewing of every stick of timber, the noise echoing from the

1. Luke ii., 38.

blow of every hammer in the erection of the Noahic ark, were "signs," indicating their approaching doom. Again,

The two angelic visitants of Sodom, and the miraculous blindness inflicted upon the marauders of the hospitable mansion of Lot, and his warning to his sons-in-law immediately upon being informed of the Lord's intention to destroy the cities of the plain, all, as "SIGNS" of coming wrath, *preceded* their destruction. So also, while the preservation of Moses from a watery grave, and his elevation to the court of Egypt as the adopted son of the king's daughter, *indicated* his high destination as the *deliverer* of his brethren from the iron grasp of their oppressor; and his slaying an Egyptian was designed as the *first evidence* of his mission as such to his brethren, at the same time acquainting them with the now almost total termination of their 430 years of affliction and servitude in a strange land; the *ten plagues* inflicted by the hand of Moses upon the infidel and imperious Egyptian king, *presaged* the final overthrow of himself and his army in the Red Sea.

The termination of the 70 years captivity seems to have been marked by no particular "signs." That period had the awakened vigilance and zeal of a Daniel to note, with infallible precision, the *lapse* of every year. But the termination of the 70 *weeks of years* was marked by the most significant "signs." Heaven and earth united in filling the moral hemisphere with forerunners of the incarnation of the Son of God, thereby awaking expectations of an approaching crisis

throughout the whole civilized world, both Gentile and Jewish. It was, as already stated, a season of universal tranquillity. A virgin daughter of Judah, according to the prediction of Isaiah,¹ was found with child of the Holy Ghost—a manger in Bethlehem of Judea, was the birth-place of the Prince of Peace—angels proclaimed to the Judean shepherds the complete accomplishment of all that the prophets had spoken of his incarnation—and a miraculous star had piloted the footsteps of the magi of the East to his cradle to do him homage.

In the light of truth and fact, therefore, we affirm that, so far from any *concealment* of a knowledge from those interested, of *time, place, and other circumstances* of ALL the most prominent predictions of the Old Testament down to the First Advent of Christ in the flesh; in *addition* to the specification of DATES, marking their commencement and termination, are also “SIGNS,” appointed as the harbingers of their approaching consummation.

We ask therefore—Why this? It is natural enough for one to suppose that, to mark the beginning and end of a predicted event by *a specific number of years*, were quite *sufficient* for all the practical purposes contemplated therein. And so it were, did we Christians, like the Babylonian captive Daniel, “*set our faces unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes,*” to examine, *that we might understand by books, THE*

1. Isa. vii., 14.

NUMBER OF THE YEARS whereof the word of the Lord speaks" in the prophecies concerning us. But, alas! alas! who can contemplate, without the deepest emotion, the sad reverse of all this! Look abroad in our churches, and among the religious orders of every name throughout christendom, and, except here and there, like angel visitants,

" ————— few and far between,"

none are to be found as *witnesses* for the momentous truth; none to assert the weighty and important fact, for which we here contend. All voices unite in *denouncing* prophetic dates! All exclaim, what can we *know* of prophecy till it be *fulfilled*?

And now, in reply, we would not dip our pen in wormwood and gall. No; we would temper the always painful task of "reproof and rebuke" of the sin of *omission* in these premises, "with meekness, and long-suffering, and patience;" and if we have drawn the picture of this sin in strong and vivid colors, it is that we may the more effectually aggrandise the boundless goodness of God in adding to prophetic *dates* prophetic "*signs*." Here, then, *we* exclaim, O love of God surpassing thought! The professed followers of Jesus, for the most part ignorant of the commencement and termination of prophetic times by a *wilful neglect* to consult the great scriptural chronometer which God has given them; yea, even *denying* the fact that such scriptural chronometer for the measurement of "times and seasons" has been given; receiving, nevertheless, through the Divine goodness,

the interposition of a *double warning*, by the institution of "SIGNS," both in the natural and moral heavens, to the intent that the latter, supplying, so to speak, the purposes of the former, may rescue them from those otherwise forgotten judgments, now nigh at hand !

" O for such love let rocks and hills,
Their lasting silence break ;
And all harmonious human tongues,
The Savior's praises speak."

Yes ; in this act of the Divine goodness, it may be truly said,

" God *only* knows the LOVE of God !"

Once more. If we take a view of the prophecies as connected with the *doctrines* which we inculcate, we cannot but perceive the harmony existing between them and the doctrinal features of Christianity. Does every PREDICTION, as we have said, comprehend within it, self the double characteristic of *judgment* and of *mercy* ? Does it consequently proclaim alike to all the voice of *warning* and of *promise* ? So we say of the GOSPEL of the Lord Jesus. It comprehends the twofold doctrine of judgment and mercy. It unfolds a merciful doctrine of divine grace—"He that *believeth* and is *baptized*, shall be *saved*." It unfolds also a gracious doctrine of divine justice, "He that *believeth not* shall be *damned*."¹ In view, therefore, of this sacred affiance between the Gospel and the Prophets, may we not demand, "What God hath thus

1. Mark xvi., 14.

joined together, let no man put asunder?"¹ To conclude therefore this branch of our subject. To my mind, as well may we hope to reap the mercies, and escape the judgments of the prophecies, though we wilfully close our eyes against both the sacred chronometer of prophecy, and the "signs of the times" which accompany them, as to hope for salvation through the Gospel, though we wilfully close our eyes against its invitations and its warnings.

These, and the like considerations, which, but for want of time, might be profitably extended, we would offer to your unbiassed and serious attention; while, by your further indulgence, we now proceed to apply prophetic "signs" to the *present* and the *future*. Yes, concerning *these*, we now say to you, "*Ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?*" For, "*when THESE THINGS begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh.*"

On entering, however, on this department of our Lecture, I would make the language of the distinguished Baxter mine, who, whenever he entered the pulpit used to say,

"I preach as if I ne'er should preach again,
And like a dying man to dying men."

Our subject is one of momentous interest. *Our* relation to it is one of common concern, which if we *would*, we *cannot* evade. It *must* prove to us a bea-

1. Matt. xix., 6.

con-light, to pilot our trembling bark into the blest haven of millennial repose; or it will be as “a *mill-stone*”¹ about our necks, to plunge us in the lowest depths of God’s coming judgments. If of any subject in the whole compass of God’s revelation to man it may be said, that it will prove a “savour of life unto life, or of death unto death,”² it is this. Yes, the present “signs of the times,” considered in the light of *evidences* of the fulfilment of prophecy, both present and future, may be viewed as the *last call*, the *last act*, the *last stoop* of God’s long-sighted, long-abused mercy to the guilty nations of men. These “signs,” therefore unheeded, till amid the darkening of the heavens by the sudden uprising of the cloudy pillar of God’s wrath, they are for ever closed to our view; and amid the clashing artillery of heaven the voice of mercy can no longer be heard, and we are lost, lost for ever! O then,

“Awake—again the Gospel trump is blown,
From year to year it swells with louder tone;
From year to year the signs of wrath
Are gathering round the Judge’s path;
Strange words fulfill’d, and mighty works achieved,
And truth in all the world, both hated and believed.”

It is due to that portion of the subject on which we are now about to enter, to remark, first, that the prophetic expositor will be called to encounter *difficulties* which, in comparison with the preceding, are neither few nor small. At least, (and this is what we mean

1. Matt. xviii., 6.

2. 2 Cor. ii., 14.

to say) our hearers will award to us the meed of *modesty* in this department of our work, in proportion as the execution of it is free from apparent presumption. This is all we ask—this is “even-handed justice.” We have admonished *them* against *incredulousness* of the Divine power to perform all that God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets — also against that spirit of *idle curiosity* which seeks to know *more* than God has revealed. It is right, therefore, that they should sit as *our* Judges, in deciding upon the proper use or abuse of Holy Scripture by us, as the mouth-piece of God to them.

This premised, we observe that *natural* signs, from their repetition, may be, and are unhesitatingly received as the unerring precursors of *ordinary* events. For instance : — The fading leaf—the falling foliage of the forest—the hoary frosts and bleak winds, admonish us of the departing glories of summer. But, when to the “signs” in the natural phenomena of the earth and the heavens, and also of other surrounding objects, there is attached a *symbolic* and *prophetic* signification; and when our knowledge of their full import, and especially of the precise periods of the world to which they refer, is indispensable to a *right application* of them, we are called to encounter difficulties in the department of prophetic exposition of which the novice is little aware. In this aspect of the subject it will not be thought strange if we speak *less* confidently of the *present* “signs of the times” in their bearing upon the *future*, than we have the *past*. But of this, as we have said, our audience is our umpire.

First, then, before we can *apply*, we must *define* those prophetic symbols denoted by the surrounding objects of nature, and of the phenomena of the earth and the heavens with which the Scriptures abound, confining ourselves, however, for want of time, to those which immediately concern us.

Says our Savior, "when these things (signs) begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." *What things?* What signs? Of these there are two classes, and they relate (as we shall prove) to two separate and distinct prophetic periods, to each of which are affixed appropriate "signs." Of the *first class* the events predicted, and their respective signs, are as follows:—

1. Great persecution, betrayal, and hatred toward all, and death to some of the disciples. The "signs" here were the *agents* at whose hands they were thus to suffer, viz., "parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends."¹

2. The next predicted event of this class is, the destruction or "desolation" of Jerusalem, as the just judgment of God upon the Jewish nation for their rejection of the Messiah, and their continued persecution and murder of his followers. Its inhabitants, the Jews, were either to fall by the edge of the sword, or to be led captive into all nations; while, of all the splendor, magnificence, and extent of the buildings of the Holy City, not one stone should be left upon another, that should not be thrown down.² The "signs" to pre-

1. Luke xxi. 12—16.

2. Luke xxi. 20, 24; and Matt. xxiv. 1; 2

cede these events were, the appearance of false Christs — wars and commotions — struggles for national pre-eminence — great and divers earthquakes, famines, and pestilences — fearful sights and great signs from heaven — and, the surrounding of the city of Jerusalem with the Roman army.

The *second class* embraces two predictions, viz, *first*, the protracted captivity and treading down of the Jewish nation and polity by the Gentiles, *until* the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled; and *second*, the appearance of the Son of Man in a cloud, with power and great glory.¹ The *end*, therefore, of the captivity and degradation of God's ancient covenant people, and the *consummation* of the Gentile economy, are to terminate *simultaneously*. Before, then, we enumerate the "Signs" which belong to this prediction, allow me to recall to your minds the following observation already made respecting them, viz, that they are designed, in the wisdom of God, to herald the fulfilment of predicted events, as *near at hand*. Now, connected with, and as immediately preceding the fulfilment of the above prophecy, are to be seen "SIGNS in the *sun*, and in the *moon*, and in the *stars*; and upon the *earth*, distress of nations with perplexity; the *sea* and the *waves* roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth;" together with the shaking of the powers of *heaven*.

We now remark that, in order to a proper under-

1. Luke xxi. 24, 27.

standing and application of these "Signs," and the events to which they respectively refer, it will be necessary to discriminate between what of them are *symbolical*, and what are *not*. If, for instance, a "Sign," as an earthquake, famine, or pestilence, *literally* precedes the predicted event to which it belongs, it is not symbolical. Hence it is divested of all ambiguity, and consequently of uncertainty, as to its *right* application. This then *we* say, and as all *authentic history*, Jewish and Christian abundantly attest, was strictly true of all those "Signs," which belong to the above *first class* of predicted events.

Of the *second class* of predictions, however, the accompanying "Signs" are strictly *Symbolical*. Strictly, we say, though not *exclusively*. *Literality*, as we shall prove, is not necessarily excluded from the office-work of a prophetic symbol. Nor is a strictly *literal* "Sign," any more than the *event* to which it refers, necessarily exclusive of a *typical* aspect. Indeed, if the *event* be typical, the "Sign" is typical also. This premised we remark, that the prophetic "Signs" or symbols now to be defined, are the following, — viz, the *sun*, the *moon*, and the *stars*, the *earth*, the *sea*, and the *waves*, *heaven*, &c.

Now, the commonly received interpretation of the above symbols, and that which may be relied on, is as follows — the *sun*, *moon*, and *stars*, represent *secular* and *ecclesiastical* authorities. By the "Signs" they shall exhibit are to be understood the *changes* through which they are to pass. "The *sea* and the *waves* roaring," are emblems of a *disturbed* and *angry* mul-

titute ; and “ *the shaking of the powers of heaven,*” (i. e. the sun, moon, and stars, the principalities and powers aforesaid,) signifies great revolutions in human governments, accompanied by the overthrow of long-continued establishments and venerable institutions. Taken together, therefore, and recollecting that this is the sublime language of Christ himself, we are furnished with a prediction which speaks of the most fearful commotions in the *national, political, ecclesiastical*, and *religious* orders of society ; yea, of *universal agitation and unexpected changes*, which are to spread their disorganizing influence among all ranks of men.

But, before we can expect that this representation will produce the wished-for conviction upon your minds, we must adduce *scriptural* precedent, if any there be, authorising the use, as above, of these objects of nature. Look back then, upon the great week of creation, when God said, “ let there be lights (the *sun*, the *moon*, and the *stars*) in the firmament of heaven.” Now, to what *end* were they ordained ? Answer. “ To divide the day from the night,” and to serve “ for seasons, and for days, and for years,” not only, but also for “ *SIGNS* :” — Yes, for “ *Signs* !” But *in what way* were they thus used ? In illustration, we refer you to Joseph’s dream, as recorded in the xxxviith Chapter of Genesis, and 9th and 10th verses. “ And he dreamed yet another dream — Behold, the *sun*, and the *moon*, and the *eleven stars*, made obeisance to me.” This dream, when made known to his venerable and pious father, brought upon Joseph the following patriarchal rebuke. “ What is this dream

that thou hast dreamed? Shall *I*, and thy *mother*, and thy *brethren* indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee, to the earth?" The *directness* and *appropriateness* of the *application* of the dream, furnish ample evidence how familiarly associated these celestial objects of nature were in the mind of the patriarch with their appointed use as "signs." This, however, may not appear so obvious to us. It is needful therefore that we inquire into the symbolic import of the sun, moon, and stars, as applied to Joseph's father, mother, and brethren, in this dream. In order to this, we remark,

1. That the sun, moon, and stars, being *different* symbols, must apply to different *persons*. Happily, of this application there is no difficulty, as will appear from the following paraphrase of the patriarch's rebuke to his dreaming son. "Shall *I*," the *sun*," and thy mother," the *moon*," "and thy brethren," who, being eleven in number, are the *eleven stars*," "indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee, to the earth?" This ascertained, and we remark,

2. That the symbolic import of the sun, moon, and stars, is to be determined from the grades of *superiority* and *subordination* peculiar to the patriarchal family compact. To this end, you have only to seat yourself in the centre of the tented circle of the patriarch Jacob's family in Canaan. In the exercise of his official functions, what do you discover to be the attributes of JACOB? Certainly, that, as *head* of the patriarchal family, he is the *source* of all *authority*: consequently that he is the *Ruler*, exercising the two-fold functions

of *king* and of *priest*. What of the patriarchal **MOTHER**? Why, that she exercises a *delegated authority* over her children. What of the **CHILDREN** of the patriarch? Why, that they are *subordinate* to the commands of parental authority.

But, these several divisions of the patriarchal compact, served but as *types* of better things to come. JACOB therefore, in his kingly and priestly character, pointed to CHRIST, who, as *king*, is the source of all authority and power, both in earth and heaven. "The powers that be," whether civil or ecclesiastical, "are ordained of him."¹ "By him *kings* rule, and *princes* decree justice."² *Monarchs, nobles, and statesmen*, "are his ministers, responsible to him for their exercise of his delegated authority. Constituted, established authority, is an ordinance of God in Christ, whether wielded according to the will of one man, or according to law, which is the result of the combined wisdom of many men. What ever has power to control, power to command, power to exact obedience on earth, — to restrain offenders, — to take the position and aspect of God towards those below, is of Christ."³ And as of civil, so of *ecclesiastical* power. Christ's declaration to his apostles was, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."⁴ As *Priest*, Christ instructs, and offers atonement for, his family, "his body, the church." He is "the *SUN* of righteousness,"⁵ her "Sun," her "Shield."⁶

1. Rom. xiii, 1.

3. McNeil. Sec. Adv. p. 52.

5. Mal. iv, 2.

2. Prov. viii. 15.

4. John xx, 21.

6. Ps. lxxxiv. 11.

The MOTHER of the patriarchal family, typified "the *Church* of the living God. "The *light* which she enjoyed, — the *authority* she exercised, was not hers by inherent right. She derived it by *delegation* from her patriarchal head. So the *Church* from CHRIST. — HE her "*head*," her "*glory*," her "*light*,"¹ — SHE the *witness* of that headship, light, and glory, till her now absent Lord's return.²

The ELEVEN SONS of Jacob were the types of the *ministry* of the church.

Turn we now to the *symbols* by which these are represented, in the dream of Joseph. The SUN, which is the fountain of life to the natural world, by the glory and splendor of his career as king of day, when viewed as a "Sign," is designed to denote "*the powers which be*," whether under one dispensation or another, whether *civil* or *ecclesiastical*. "The MOON is a *witness* for the sun, shining with a light that is not her own; shedding much lustre indeed, but only by reflection, having received it from him, that she may bear witness for him during his absence. In this the moon is a "Sign" of the *Church* of God."³ The ELEVEN STARS symbolize the *ministry* of the Church. In the book of Revelation it is thus written — "The mystery of the *seven stars* which thou sawest in my right hand, — are the *angels* (or messengers, or ministers) of the seven churches."⁴

1. 1 Cor. xi., 3; Eph. v., 23; Col. ii., 10; Isa. lx., 19; 1 John, i., 5; Luke ii., 32; John i., 9.

2. Acts x., 43; xiii., 30—32. 3. McNeil. Sec. Adv. p. 53.

4. Rev. i., 20.

Of the *other* prophetic symbols, that of the *earth* denotes the territories which were the seat of the four great empires, pourtrayed in the vision of the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, as interpreted by Daniel. ¹ *Heaven* is the political and ecclesiastical firmament, so to speak, in which the above symbolical planets appear, and to which reference is made in the expression, "yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also *heaven*."² And the *sea* and the *waves* symbolize multitudes of people, etc. Hence the prophet Jeremiah, in speaking of the invasion of Babylon by the *Medes* and *Persians*, says, "The *sea* is come up on Babylon; she is covered with the *multitude of the waves* thereof."³ So the prophet Isaiah. "Woe to the *multitude of many people*, which make a noise like the noise of the *seas*; and to the rushing of *nations*, that makes a rushing like the rushing of many *waters*."⁴ And in the Revelation it is said, "The *waters* which thou sawest where the whore sitteth, are *peoples*, and *multitudes* and *nations*, and *tongues*."⁵

With deference therefore I submit, whether the commonly received interpretation of the above symbols as used by Christ, may not be relied on.

This determined, it now remains to assign to these significant "Signs," their relative position in prophecy. Are they the harbingers of events that are *past*? or are they the heralds of events that are *now* transpiring,

1. Dan. ii., 31—45; Rev. 6. 8.

2. Heb. xii., 26.

3. Jer. li., 42.

4. Isa. xlvii., 12.

5. Rev. xvii. 15.

and are about *soon* to transpire? If the harbingers of the *past*, then they are of *no* interest to us, except as mere matter of *history*. But if the heralds of the *present* and the *future*; if they signify that the most portentous of the remaining few events which are to complete the prophetic drama are now in course of fulfilment; and that many, if not most of those who now hear me, *may live* to witness the pouring out of the *last vial* of God's wrath upon the ungodly, and to hear the long and the loud blasts of the *last* prophetic trump;—O, what mind can conceive, what tongue can pourtray, the height, and depth, and length, and breadth, of our *interest* in them, and of our *responsibility* in relation to them! And, we now remark, that, in our view, they can be applied in no sense, except to the *present* and the *future*. With the *past*, they have nothing to do, except that, as symbolizing the events which were to *close up* the Gentile economy, they were announced by Christ more than 1800 years ago.

But, to this it is objected, that the passage, "*Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled,*"¹ is fatal to such a conclusion; this passage being quoted as parallel to the following: "*there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, until they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*"² In answer, we admit that this *latter* passage has reference to the *term of life* of those to whom Christ spake. And, if the historic dates of *three* of the Gospels, viz, those of St.

1. Matt. xxiv. 34.

2. Matt. xvi. 28.

Matthew, Mark, and Luke may be relied on, it was *literally verified to them all* on the *sixth*, or as St. Luke has it, about *eight* days after; when, on the Mount of Transfiguration, they beheld Christ in his *glorified* body, with Moses as the representative of the *raised*, and Elias those of the *translated* Saints, who are to constitute the copartners of his throne, while themselves were the pattern of the *subordinate* subjects of that kingdom of which this was the manifested shadow. But the *former* passage we affirm, is not thus restricted. The words translated "*this generation*," *ἡ γὰρ αὕτη*, — (*e genea aute*, —) must be understood to signify, *this race of men*. "Our Lord Jesus never uses the word *generation* to signify the term of man's life; but commonly to express the peculiar *character* of the *nation* or *people* to whom he applies it.— e. g., "*a sinful generation*" — "*a faithless and perverse generation*"¹ — "*a righteous generation*,"² &c. This sense is confirmed by the last verse of the 23rd chapter of St. Mark's gospel. "Behold, *your* house is left unto *you* desolate: for I say unto you, *ye* shall not see me henceforth, till *ye* shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Now, this declaration, as it is evident that that generation of Jews to whom it was made, continued to *reject* the Messiah *till the last*, evidently speaks of that *prolonged*

1. Matt. xviii., 1—9; Mark ix., 1—10; Luke ix. 27—36.

2. Brook's Essay, part 2nd., p. 17 and *note*. See Matt. xii., 39; xviii., 17; Mark vii. 38.

3. See Ps. xiv., 5; xxiv., 6; lxxiii. 15.

national desolation which was only to terminate at the SECOND ADVENT.

But it is again objected, that the passage, "*then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of time, no, nor ever shall be,*"¹ confines the application of all the "signs" enumerated, to the destruction of Jerusalem. To this however, it may be replied, that, admitting to the fullest extent all that can be claimed for the horrible calamities attendant upon the siege of Jerusalem by the Roman army, yet it cannot be viewed as "without a parallel. The tribulation at the *former* siege of Jerusalem was very similar in this respect"² to the *second*. For, during the siege under *Titus*, were women led by hunger to devour their own children? So, of the *Chaldean* besiegement the prophet Jeremiah says, "'and I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend in the siege and straitness, where-with their enemies and they that seek their life shall straiten them."³ And afterwards, in his lamentations over the destruction of the city, he shews that these things were actually fulfilled:—"Behold, O Lord, and consider to whom thou hast done this. Shall the women eat their fruit and children of a span long?"⁴—"The hands of the pitiful women *have* sodden their own children; they were their *meat* in the destruction of the daughter of my people."⁴

1. Matt. xxiv. 21; Mark xiii. 19.

2. Brook's Ess. Part. 2nd p. 13.

3. Jer. xix., 8, 9.

4. Brook's Ess. Part 2nd p. 13, 14. Lam. ii., 20; iv., 10.

But again. Those commentators who confine the above "signs" to the tribulation of Jerusalem, admit that "*the time of trouble*" spoken of by Daniel, Chap. xii., 1, 2, is yet FUTURE. "But, there is a remarkable notification attached to each of these passages, by means of which both periods of trouble may be clearly demonstrated to be *connected* together. Daniel says, "there shall be a time of trouble, *such as never was since there was a nation to that same time.*" St. Matthew, that it is "*such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time.*"—And then adds, — "NO, NOR EVER SHALL BE." Thus in both places the tribulation is described as *unprecedented*; but in Matthew it is stated *besides*, that the one referred to by him shall *never subsequently have a parallel*. How then, I ask, can the tribulation in Daniel *follow* that in Matthew?"¹

Finally, regarding this "tribulation" we remark, that it was to be *perpetuated* through a long and dreary night of painful captivity and degradation to the Jewish people, under the *dominance* of the gentiles. Says the Savior, they "*shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles, UNTIL the times of the gentiles be fulfilled.*"²

The phrase, "times of the gentiles," we remark, properly comprehends the whole period of Jewish tribulation under both captivities, during the dominance of the four gentile monarchies. 1st. The Ba-

1. Brook's Ess. Part 2nd p. 12, 13.

2. Luke xxi. 24.

bylonian,¹ — 2nd. the *Medo-Persian*,² — 3rd. the *Grecian*,³ and 4th the *Roman*.⁴ In the xxvith Chapter of Leviticus, verses 18, 21, 24, and 28, it is predicted that the Jewish nation shall be "chastened *seven times*, or sevenfold, for their sins. The frequent repetition of seven times, or sevenfold, connected with their lengthened suffering under the gentile monarchies, seems to point out a special design, and may intimate *the length of time* which these chastisements should last;"⁵ which, if interpreted as we do the times in Daniel, amount to a period of 2520 years. This period is again brought to view, as typified in the *seven times* which passed over Nebuchadnezzar.

Additional confirmation of this view of the prolonged tribulation of the Jews may be collected from the fact, that the prophet Daniel predicts the same coming of the son of man in the clouds of heaven at the *termination* of their troubles, as does St. Luke, as will appear by comparing Dan. vii., 13, 22, with St. Luke xxi., 27. Finally, Daniel, in the ixth chapter of his book, closes his predicted events of the 70 weeks, with an allusion to "an indefinite period," v. 26, "the events of which are, the destruction of the city and temple by the Romans, *and the Jewish desolation*," all of which are explained by the prophecies and their accompanying signs, *now* under considera-

1. Dan. ii., 32 — 38.

2. Dan. ii., 39; v. 26 — 28.

3. Dan. viii. 20, 21. See 2 Maccab. ii. 1 — 4. 4. John xi. 48; xix., 15.

5. Bickersteth's guide, p. 135.

tion. All those events predicted by Christ, Luke xvi., 8—24, *except the domination of the gentiles over the Jews spoken of in the last clause of the last mentioned verse*, received their complete and literal fulfilment in the destruction of Jerusalem, and the attendant captivity of the Jewish nation. And we now remark, that that captivity has continued from the year 70 of our Lord, down to this very hour, first under the *Romans*, then under the *Saracens*, then under the *Turks*, and now under the *Egyptians*. Yes, these gentile nations, have, one after another, held the holy city in a degrading bondage: but, mark the language; "*Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the gentiles, UNTIL the times of the gentiles be FULFILLED.*"

Is it now asked, *when* will this be? When will gentile domination, still lifting its iron sceptre in shouts of lofty defiance over the ancient heritage of the Lord, and their long-protracted tribulation terminate? I answer, at the *end* of the 2300 prophetic days of the viiith chapter and 14th verse of Daniel, which, in our previous Lecture, we demonstrated *fa .s* in with the year of our Lord, 1847!

To *this* period, we now renewedly affirm, in connexion with the point of time on which we *now* stand, all the "signs" mentioned in the three verses immediately preceding our text, belong. "*And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars: and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring: men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after*

those things which are coming on the earth : for the powers of heaven shall be shaken."

Here it is perhaps due to myself to remark, that possibly my audience and I are quite at issue as to the *mode* which I have adopted in conducting the exposition of this subject. But I respectfully ask, of what avail is it to write, or talk, or preach about "*Signs*," unless we can demonstrate them to have been *appointed* of God for certain wise, and holy, and gracious *ends*? And even this done, of what avail is it, comparatively, that in *ages past*, the heaven of providence has been studded with "*Signs*" multitudinous as yon twinkling stars? I say, comparatively — for, having accomplished the purposes of *their* appointment, they are of interest to us simply as matter of *history*. No. I should consider it alike unworthy your intelligence or patient attention, to address you even for ten minutes in a Lecture on "*the signs of the times*," unless I could demonstrate that you, and I, yea, and all the world, even the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations of every clime, had an *interest* in them. No, nor even then, comparatively, unless I could equally demonstrate, that one and all had an interest in them NOW! And I now confess to you, that, if in this stage of our advance, I have failed in producing in your minds a conviction of this momentous truth, then has my labor indeed been vain. But, this end attained, and I am assured of your entire satisfaction with the very brief remarks which are now to accompany the pre-

sent "Signs of the times," with a recapitulation of which, our Lecture will close.

How lamentable the reflection, that the prophetic book of Isaiah opens with the following solemn appeal, wrung from his reluctant lips, against the people of his nation. "Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken — Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters! They have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the holy one of Israel to anger, they are gone away backward!"¹ Christian friends, do any of *you* know this picture? Ah,

"— What are heaven's alarms to hearts that can cower
In wilful slumber deepening every hour,
That draw the curtains closer round,
The nearer swells the Trumpet's sound,
Lord, e'er *our* trembling souls sink down and die,
Teach us with chastening hand, and make us feel thee nigh."

Brethren and hearers, as Moses with Jeshurun, who "forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the rock of his salvation," so would we expostulate with all such in this day. "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would *consider* their LATTER END!"²

To give a proper direction to our meditations on the *present* "SIGNS OF THE TIMES," the first which we shall mention, is,

1. Isa. i., 3, 4.

2. Deut. xxxii. 32—39.

1. *The prevalent disinclination of Christian professors and others, to think of, or to study the subjects of unfulfilled Scripture prophecy.* Now this "Sign," we affirm, answers to that state of apostacy throughout the Christian world, predicted in that fearful interrogation of Christ, "*When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find FAITH on the earth?*"¹ That our blessed Lord in this passage speaks of his *Second Advent*, none will deny. That he speaks of a *personal* and not a *spiritual* advent merely, is evident from the fact, that he has never yet been spiritually *absent* from the Church. In this last sense the promise was given, "Lo, I am with you *ALWAY*, even unto *the end of the world.*"² And, that this second advent is to be *pre-mil-lennial*, is equally evident, as will appear from the passage, "*Behold, your house is left unto you desolate, and ye shall not see me henceforth, TILL ye shall say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.*" Now, this cannot refer to the *First* advent. That had taken place already. The word "cometh" in this passage, (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*,) may be rendered, "*that is about to come,*"³ Nor can it refer to the shouts of the multitude upon Christ's triumphant entrance into Jerusalem. That event took place *before* the utterance of this prediction.⁴ No—the time here referred to is the *end* of the Jewish tribulation, and of the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles: or, in other words, to the

1. Luke xviii. 8.

2. Matt. xxviii., 20.

3. Ramsey on the sec. com. p. 96.

4. Compare Matt. xxi. 1—9, with xxiii. 39.

restoration of the Jews to their own land. Then, "the feet of the Lord shall stand upon the *Mount of Olives*,"¹ at which time "the spirit of grace and of supplications shall be poured out upon them; and *looking upon him whom they have pierced*, they shall *mourn*."² And, methinks, amid the piercing agonies of the conviction that they once, "with wicked hands, crucified and slew the Lord of life and glory,"³ and the ecstasies arising from a sense of pardoned guilt, will exclaim, "*Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.*"

This, then, we say, is the *repudiated faith* to which the Saviour, speaking of the time *immediately preceding* his second advent, refers. And if the subject needs further confirmation, I would refer to Isaiah, who, speaking of this very period of the conversion and glory of the Jewish nation, says, that immediately preceding, "*darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people.*"⁴

Now, look the world over — pry into every nook and corner of Christendom — and what proportion of it, I ask, are "looking for that blessed hope, the glorious [Pre-Millennial] appearing of the Great God, *even* our Saviour Jesus Christ?"⁵ O, on this subject, I almost tremble to enlarge. Still, you demand evidence. Take then the following as an illustration. In this great city, which counts its hundreds of Christian

1. Zech. xiv. 4.

2. Zech. xii. 10.

3. Acts ii. 23.

4. Isa. lx. 1, 2.

5. Titus ii. 13.

churches, planted in the midst of a population of hundreds of thousands, there is not *one voice* regularly raised from Sunday to Sunday, to sound the alarm of the rapidly-approaching pre-millennial advent of the Lord Jesus ! We ask therefore, — Why is it thus ? Would it so be, were the people, *clerical* and *lay*, disposed to *think* of, and to *study* this subject ? I add no more, brethren, on this topic, but to ask, Is this a “sign” of these “last times ?” What then *think* ye of it ? Will you *study* it ? I add,

2. Another “Sign” of the times, connected with, because growing out of, the preceding. It is this—*A most melancholy and general decay of vital piety.* Opposed to the above prevailing disposition of Christians in reference to Christ’s advent, was the following prominent characteristic of the Saints primitively — they “*loved his appearing.*”¹ Yes, they loved to *hear* of it — to *talk* about it — to *pray* for it. Hence, of them it could in truth be said, “Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own ; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, *therefore* the world *hateth* you.”² But what, I ask, *now* remains of this distinguishing feature of Christianity ? What, on the part of professing Christians to cling to “the *offence* of the cross ?”³ Has not that “offence” long since ceased,⁴ by an un-

1. 2 Tim. iv. 8.

3. Gal. v., 11.

2. John xv. 19.

4. Gal. v. 11.

holy alliance between *Christ* and *Belial*, — between the *church* and the *world*?

Brethren, God is my record, I judge no man.¹ Nor, as a Christian minister would I enjoin upon any of you either the moroseness of the misanthrope, or the monkish austerities of the recluse. Still, the love of mammon — the spirit of worldliness — of conformity to the world in its maxims and fashions, indicate, to a most fearful and appalling extent, the prevalence of this unholy alliance! Yes, the almost universal rage for the mere “pomp and outward circumstance” of religion, while it proves that we have its “*form*,” it also proves that we are destitute of its “*power*,”² and verifies to the letter, the truth of our Lord’s words, that in the last times, “*the love of many should wax cold*.”³ Professor of religion, what think ye of *this* “Sign?” Is it shadowed forth in *your* conduct toward your *now absent* Lord and Master?

3. Another “Sign” which is to herald the pre-milennial advent of Christ is, *an unprecedented prevalence of iniquity*. Says our Saviour, “*Iniquity shall abound*.”⁴ We now speak of that MORAL turpitude, *intellectual* and *practical*, which, according to the above prediction, is to characterize this age. And, in both these respects, we fearlessly challenge the historian to designate the period when, the world over, the vain imaginations of man approximated nearer to a DEIFICATION of *human* intellect; or, when the flood-

1. Rom. xiv. 13.

3. Matt. xxiv. 12.

2. 2 Tim. iii. 5.

4. Matt. xxiv. 12.

gates of iniquity poured from its exhaustless reservoir, such streams of licentiousness. With what unprecedented and heaven-daring effrontery are the Scriptures now rejected, to give place to the giant strides of human intellect in *this* age, signalized as "the march of mind," "human progress," &c. "With what impunity are the *doctrines* of the Cross trampled under foot? How is the name of God blasphemed, by the liberalism, false philosophy, and infidelity of the age!"¹ Nor would I shock your sensibilities by raising the curtain, and exhibiting to your view even a moiety of the iniquitous practices with which all the larger cities of every nation and country abound! It must now suffice that we refer you to the dark catalogue of crimes, under the heads of *perfidy*, and *fraud*, and *rapine*, and *murder*, and *sedition*, and universal *misrule*, which darken the columns of every secular print throughout our own and every other land. Yes, to these faithful chroniclers of crime can I refer you, as infallible, though undesigned expositors of the truth of this prophetic sign.

Nor, as comprehended under this sign of the prevalence of iniquity can we confine our remarks to the more *overt* acts of the ungodly. Would that it were so! But, alas, we are compelled, as well from a regard to truth as to a sense of duty, to bring to view, and apply, with all plainness of speech, those features of apostacy of these last times, which were to characterise christianity both *doctrinal* and *practical*, as

1. Dis. on the present crisis, p. 10.

brought to view in the following passage of the Apostle Paul.

*"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away."*¹

How similar this, to a previous description given by the same pen, of the *Pagan world*!² But, that the Apostle in the above passage is speaking of *others* — that by prophetic discernment, he pointed to those corrupting and disorganizing influences which were to characterize the *Christianity* and the *Church* of the "last days," is we think evident from the fact that the above signs of Apostacy are coupled with "*a form of godliness.*" And, how humiliating, how painful the reflection, that the two portraits of moral corruption and Christian degeneracy as above depicted by St. Paul, should bear so strong a resemblance!

Our limits, however, will not admit of an extended application of these characteristics; in regard to which, as it respects *individuals*, we are happy to say, there are yet many noble exceptions. No. We

1. 2 Tim. iii, 1 — 5.

2. Rom. i, 29 — 31.

speak now in the more enlarged sense, as comprehending the aggregate of those communities, the various grades of which form the great mass of society, and in the midst of which those are to be found, to whom the above characteristics apply. Of these, the Apostle predicts that in the last days they should be,

1. "*Lovers of their own selves*:" i. e., that they should be *selfish*, a principle directly opposed to that exalted grace of charity, so largely treated of in 1 Cor. xiii., and which seeks to dispense its benignant smiles and extend its open hand to the oppressed and the perishing, wherever found: a principle, every element of which, as a late writer has justly remarked, is **ANTI-SOCIAL**. "Charity," it is said, *seeketh not her own*." Now, apply this principle to the great mass of those who have "a form of godliness," in their *practical* operations as connected with the commercial, mercantile, manufacturing, mechanical, and even the lower departments of life. Carry it into the ranks of the opulent—among the different professions—among landlords and tenants.—Now, is it not true, and true more especially of these "last days," that in commerce, the large consumer or purchaser grinds the manufacturer, who seeks in turn to reimburse himself by reducing the wages of the mechanic, &c., &c., while all the various grades are made to writhe under the undeviating extortion of the landlord, till, by the accumulated weight of oppression of the higher upon the lower classes, redress is

sought in incendiarism or political revolution? But, the Apostle adds, that men should be,

2. "*Covetous.*" "*φιλαργυροί*," literally, lovers of money. Hence its affinity with the preceding. Yes, selfishness begets covetousness. The cupidity of man, the love of ease, luxury, pleasure, power, creates an inordinate thirst for gain. Time was, when covetousness wore the mask of "sober industry and prudence:" not so now. The rage of speculation, induced by a spirit of "discontent at *ordinary* prosperity," has resulted in a "making haste to get rich," so characteristic of the *present* day. Please turn to and read 1 Tim. vi., 9, 10. Are professors of religion wholly exempt from this spirit? Are there none who, even at the holy altar, seek to make "*gain of godliness?*"¹ Men should also be,

3. "*Boasters.*" — Selfishness and covetousness combined, lead to indulgence in self-complacency, self-adulation; and these generate a spirit of "boasting," the opposite of charity, which "*vaunteth not itself.*" Nationally, the "*vox Dei*" is brought down to an equality with, if not indeed made subordinate to, the "*vox Populi.*" Do any doubt this? What then the meaning of the following and similar phrases that meet the eye at every turn, — and which are common alike to the politics, science, and theology of the age? "*We, the sovereign people*" — "*march of mind*" — "*human progress,*" &c., all of which indicate a for-

1. Tim. vi., 5.

getfulness of that Divine power which ruleth over the destiny alike of nations and of individuals. Consult St. James on this subject.¹ "All such boasting is vain." Passing this, the Apostle says that men should be,

4. "*Proud*." — The disposition here intended is, that of contemning and setting at naught the authority of God, as illustrated in the following passages — Neh. ix. 16; Ps. cxix. 21, 51; Jer. xliii. 2. As applicable to our own times, it is sufficient (though equally true of *all* the commands of God) that we instance the present universal desecration of the **SABBATH**. In view of all the Divine injunctions regarding holy time, do not the mass with one voice exclaim, "*who is the Lord, that I should obey him?*"² That men should be,

5. "*Blasphemers*," is another predicted characteristic of the last days. Scriptural blasphemy "consists, first, in speaking against the revelation or ordinances of God; and secondly, in the avowal of heretical doctrines, indirectly calculated to degrade the glory of the triune Jehovah, and the gospel of his grace." And such are the Socinian and modern Unitarian heresies, the promoters of which, under the reign of William III.,³ were held to be *criminals*. And, while we consider these heresies as "*damnable*"⁴ they cannot withhold from us the meed of candor in conceding that *now* an *unchecked liberalism*

1. James iv., 13 — 16.

2. Exod. v., 2.

3. See the 9th, and 13th of William III., Chap. 32. 4. 2 Pet. ii. 1.

has removed from them all restraint, and that, by a rapidly increasing coalition with the various grades of existing *semi*-protestant Orthodoxy, there is a fair prospect before them of repeating the scenes of other days, and joining issue with their sister compeer (France) in the *Deification* of human reason. Of the prevalence of this species of "blasphemy" we affirm, (and we challenge contradiction,) no period in the history of Christendom, will compare with the last *fifty years*. It was in A. D. 1792, just fifty years ago, since atheistic France made a general bou-fire of the Scriptures, — designated Jesus Christ as "the wretch," — pronounced death to be an eternal sleep, — and bowed themselves before the shrine of a prostitute, as a personification of the goddess of reason ! And, to a similar, yea, and to a more fearful consummation, is the tendency of every existing species of heretical blasphemy, however modified its *present* form. We pass to the next of the above characteristics of the age, — viz., that of being,

6. "*Disobedient to parents.*" In the broad sense, of parents there are several orders, which we shall classify as follows : God is our *heavenly*, our *spiritual* Father, — "the powers which be," in the state, constitute our *national* or *political* father, — in the church, our *ecclesiastical* father, — in the departments of *education*, our teachers may be called fathers — and, our parents are our *natural* father and mother. Now, in illustration of that disobedience towards God as our heavenly, our spiritual Father, which characterizes these "last days," turn back and read the 4th article in

this category. Of the others, whether of the *civil* magistracy, or the sacred orders of the ministry, as *spiritual* rulers, or of teachers, how evident the disposition among all classes of subordinates to “despise government,”¹ and “dominion” and to “speak evil of dignities?”² And, “in regard to disobedience to *natural* parents, it is a circumstance so commonly noticed by persons at all observant of the moral character of the age, as especially belonging to the present times, that it requires no further comment. A great declension has been noticed in this respect in the last half-century, as compared with the times immediately preceding. Indeed I fear, that it would now provoke the laughter of many, were they to be seriously reminded, that the sons and daughters of patriarchal times rose up before their parents and superiors, and did them homage.”³

Filial insubordination may be traced to the following and similar *causes*.—A rejection of the *headship* of the family compact⁴ — neglect of parental *discipline*, so that parents have now come to treat their children with the familiarity of brothers and sisters, rather than of sons and daughters; and to make it a moral question, whether it be right to coerce or to chastise them:⁵ the effect of which is to engender, first, disrespect, and second, contempt. And, this disposition of mind once

1. 2 Pet. ii. 10.

2. Jude 8.

3. Gen. xxi. 31; 1 Kings ii. 19; Lev. xix. 32.

4. 1 Pet. iii., 1—6; Eph. v. 22, 24.

5. Compare Heb. xii., 9, 10; Prov. xxix. 15; xxii., 15, with x., 13; xiii., 24.

gaining the ascendancy over the mind of a child, it grows with his growth and strengthens with his strength, till, passing through all the *intermediate* grades of insubordination, it reaches the throne of God! We pass to the next article. Men should be,

7. "*Unthankful.*" The spirit of disobedience, of insubordination to the powers which be, as comprehending the various orders from our natural parents up the great Parent of all, coming in contact with those of "boasting," and "pride," (see articles 3 and 4,) its natural allies, begets that feeling of *independence* which says, "*My* power, and the might of *mine* hand hath gotten me these things?"¹ Hence men are "*unthankful.*" Are our national *fasts* in times of calamity treated by the mass with neglect and derision. Our national *thanksgivings* are converted into seasons of inordinate indulgence. And, viewed as a *religious* act, how often is the public or family "grace before meat" followed by "the *Non Nobis Domine*, after the repast?" And, in offering up prayers in the great congregation at the request "of persons under affliction or in sickness, how few out of the number restored are found to return thanks? Alas! though "*ten* may be cleansed, there is found only *one* to return thanks to God."² Above all, see this spirit of ingratitude on the part of the people to their God and Saviour in all our churches, on those Sundays devoted to the commemoration of the sufferings and death of our Lord in the holy Eucharist. See the dying love of Christ

1. Deut. viii., 17.

2. Luke xvii., 17.

in the redemption of the world as then and there slighted, by the crowds who *refuse* to "draw near with faith, and partake of that holy Sacrament."

8. "*Unholy.*" Let it not be forgotten that the Apostle is treating of those who have "a *form* of godliness." Nor is it difficult to describe such. Their language is not how much of *self-sacrifice* will it "cost" me to be a Christian? but *how far* may I conform myself to the maxims and customs of the world, and still *retain* the Christian name? Hence such are ever ready to denounce as puritanical and enthusiastic, every grade of religious character that rises above *their* standard. Some of them have conformed *outwardly* to ALL the ordinances and rites of the Church—*Baptism, Confirmation, and the Lord's Supper.* But the unholiness of the age may be inferred from the low and worldly views and motives which actuate many in seeking admission thereto, and especially of those who though they have been baptized and confirmed, yet abstain from the holy communion, because "it does more solemnly engage them to that holiness which they are resolved not follow after." They have a *name* to live, but they are *dead.*¹ They "*profess to know God, but in works deny him.*"² Oh, how great, we fear, is the number of such! Another predicted characteristic of these times is, that men should be,

9. "*Without natural affection.*" The time was, when children were considered a "gift and heritage

1. See Matt. vii., 21; xvi., 24.; Luke xiv., 28.

2. Rev. iii., 1.

3. Titus i., 16.

which cometh of the Lord, and that that man was *happy* that had his quiver full of them." ¹ But what is now more common than those expressions which more than imply that they are "an incumbrance and misfortune?" How rare, also, the instances of such "children and nephews" as those spoken of by St. Paul, 1 Tim. v. 4.? E'er they have entered upon their teens, thousands are committed to the dubious influences of foreign culture, physical and mental, scientific and religious; while thousands more, alienated from their early homes by parental apathy, are precipitated upon the wide ocean of adventure, heedless of what awaits them; and all this based upon that Atheistic, anti-social principle, of which we have already spoken, and which teaches "that we should love all men alike; and that the preferences which we show to the more intimate relationships is a prejudice, and an offence to uniformity and equality of love; and, in an age when *liberality* is the object of universal worship, and public opinion of men, not the word of God, is the common law, nothing else is to be expected but *a dissolution of the bonds of natural affection*, and the increase of crime in every direction." But another mark of these last days;—

10. "*Truce-breakers.*" This "refers to that state of mind, which, if it enters into covenant, does so without intending to be bound by it, but to break it whenever the passions or expediency invite." Hence, nations violate the laws of *neutrality*. The same may

1. Ps. cxxvii.

be said of public *pledges* and *principles*. In all the departments of business "the same recklessness of oaths and engagements" are proverbial among men. But, more appalling still is the prevalence of this "truce-breaking" spirit in the church. Apply this subject to those solemn obligations assumed at *baptism*. "Oh! how lightly is the covenant entered into in the first instance, and how awfully despised and trampled under foot afterwards!" The same may be said of the assumption of baptismal vows at *confirmation*, the recipients of that sacred rite, in numerous instances, making no further advances; and if they do, their obliging themselves to a more holy life by a participation of the holy Eucharist, furnishing no evidence that they rightly "discern the Lord's body."

11. "*False accusers*." Upon this characteristic it is unnecessary that I enlarge. The universality of its prevalence among all classes, precludes the necessity of adducing evidence of its existence. "Charity envieth not," and "thinketh no evil." But of all the viperous brood of the censorious, wanton, and malignant, there is not one left to "cast the first stone;" and in the church, as well as out of the church, are to be found those who habitually cater to the appetites of the lovers of scandal, and innocence and purity oftentimes seeks refuge in the cold earth, from the pestiferous breath of an inuendo.

12. "*Incontinent*," or the surrendering of oneself to the dominion of unbridled appetites. See this exemplified in an inordinate ambition after display in the costliness and magnificence of our "ceiled houses"—in

our equipage—in our effeminacy and luxury—in our immoderate love of dress—of indulgence in “vain and foolish talking and jesting,”¹ and of frequenting those scenes of vice and profligacy, which pander to and consequently awaken, all the baser passions of our nature. With a late writer on this subject, I add, that “I do not feel justified in going at large into the proofs of direct sensual incontinency. I will satisfy myself with appealing to the testimony of all moralists who have had an opportunity of observing the state of society abroad and at home. There never was a period when the habits of men were so generally profligate. But * * * I would draw a veil over this part of my painful subject.”

13. “*Fierce.*” The fruit of incontinent indulgence, as just described. He who has not obtained the mastery over his other passions, will scarcely aim at imitating the example of “the Prince of Peace,”² who was “*meek and lowly in heart,*”³ in curbing that unruly member, the *tongue*. This unhallowed instrument “*sets on fire the course of nature!*”⁴ Nor can history record the period when this fire raged with more unabated fury and extent than now. What, brook a contradiction! Let the results of intemperate language in high places answer. Grave of Cilley, answer! and, as in our own, so in other countries, this *fierceness* of spirit now rages with redoubled fury. “The law of honor” seeks satisfaction at the sacrifice of human

1. Hag. i., 4.

3. Matt. xi., 29.

2. Isa. ix., 6

4. James iii., 6.

life for the most trivial affront. And this fire, burning thus fiercely in the breast of the statesman, spreads its destructive ravages to a most fearful extent, though perhaps in a different form, among the lower orders of all classes. "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame!"¹

14. "*Despisers of them that are good.*" The "good" here are those who, like Enoch of old, "*walk with God?*"² But "they (the scornful) that sit in the gate speak against them, and they are the song of the drunkard."³

15. "*Traitors.*" Yes. Many, now having "the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof," upon the manifestation of the ascendant anti-christian principle, Infidelity, like Judas of old, will give the traitorous kiss, and betray into the hands of the "man of sin and son of perdition" thousands of the deluded votaries of Deism, modern Unitarianism, and Socinianism. And, as though to render this work doubly sure, and as the righteous retribution of heaven upon them for their wilful blindness,⁴ "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."⁵

16. "*Heady.*"

17. "*High-minded.*" These characteristics may well go together. They are but streams which flow

1. Jude 13.

2.

3. Ps. lxi., 19

4.

5. 2 Thess ii., 11, 12.

from the same corrupt source with those of boasting, pride, disobedience, fierceness, &c. Hence, they "despise government—they are self-willed—they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities."¹ Their language is, "*with our tongue will we prevail* ; our lips are our own ; who is Lord over us ?"

18. "*Lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God.*" As connected with a form of godliness, we are to understand this characteristic as descriptive of an inordinate fondness for the mere pomp and outward circumstance of religion ; the gratification of an excessive fastidiousness as to the matter and manner of the preacher, the quality of the music, &c. Hence the present predominating love of novelty and excitement, and the running from church to church, as from one theatre to another ; so that not unseldom the judicious, able, time-worn, though unassuming minister of Christ, is exchanged for the clerical comedian.

Then, too, this disposition is seen in unchecked indulgence in the pleasures and amusements of the world, in which nominal professors of religion so largely participate. All indulgence with such is considered as "harmless," "innocent," and the like, that falls not under the imputation of "notorious evil living."²

Nor can we pass that class of "lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God," who, not content with the

1. 2 Pet. ii., 10.

2. See the Rubric to Communion Service. Book of Common Prayer.

ordinary avenues to wealth, have, under "a form of godliness," sought to "make merchandize" of christianity, by erecting large and magnificent places of worship, and supporting a succession of popular pulpit actors, as a matter of mere speculation.

19. "*Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.*" It is then assumed that the *truth* of these predicted characteristics of "the last days," and of their *special applicability* to our own times, none will pretend either to gainsay or resist; and if there is anything in these premises calculated to impose a more than ordinary tax upon our credulity, it would seem to be this—that so many, both in *theory and practice*, should *deny* not only, but in heart *despise* religion, and yet invest themselves with its outward "form." See this exemplified in almost every religious organization of the day, where the true principles of the gospel are made subservient to personal name and influence and wealth, "because of advantage."¹ No. "There is in the present age no want of high patronage, when solicited, for our various evangelical institutions; no deficiency of persons to take the chair, and preside on religious occasions; no want of the form of church-going, baptism, &c.; but the very men who can thus far approve religion, and "do many things gladly," betray either a smile of contempt or a feeling of repugnance," the moment you speak of religion as imparting *spiritual power* to the soul of the believer.

Nor is this all. What is of more common occur-

1. Jude 16.

rence in these days, than the cry of, "PERSECUTION!" by the various heretical sects, e. g., Deists, modern Unitarians, Socinians, Universalists, German Neologists, &c., because, forsooth, we withhold from them all right to the *Christian* name. Of this however, we can no longer (comparatively) complain, when various systems of perverted philosophy is employed in sowing anew the seeds of ATHEISM, under the pre text of promoting Christianity.

Here then, under the influence of the all-potent alembic of *modern liberalism*, we have Heretics, of every name, and Infidels, and Atheists, though differing widely from each other, yet joining issue in laying claim to and using the *Christian name*! "HAVING A FORM OF GODLINESS, BUT DENYING THE POWER THEREOF." We do therefore most solemnly affirm, and challenge contradiction, that the above Pauline prediction of the marks of Christian apostacy of "THE LAST DAYS," if they have any meaning, and if they apply to any age, their import is verified to a fearful extent throughout Christendom at this very moment; and consequently, that they apply to our own times. Yes, that this is most emphatically THE TIME that the apostle in 2 Tim. iv., 3, predicted would come, when "men would not endure *sound* doctrine; but that after their own lusts they should heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears." Heaven prepare the humble few of the faithful in Christ Jesus, to meet with becoming composure and fortitude the consummation of these mysterious

workings of iniquity, in the establishment in his seat of the last *Anti-Christian* power! We pass,

4. To the predicted prevalence of *SCOFFERS* in these last times, as another "*Sign*," designed to indicate the speedy appearance of the son of man in clouds. Says St. Peter, "there shall come in the last days *scoffers*, walking after their own lusts, and saying, *where is the promise of his coming?* For since the father's fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation."¹ Nor, sad to tell, is even *this* class necessarily and exclusively confined to the *unbelieving world*. Would God it were so! But, how many professing Christians, forgetting that "the Lord *is not sluck* concerning his promises," that the faithful in Christ Je us shall in due time inherit that "New heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;"² join with the Infidel scoffer and say, "where is the promise of his coming?" What "*Signs*" are to be given that he will so come? Ah, none so blind as those who *will not see*. Alas, for *such* is reserved the *greater* condemnation.³

5. The fifth Pre-millennial advent "*Sign*" is, *the universal spread of the GOSPEL among all nations*. Says our Lord, "This GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM shall be preached as a WITNESS among all nations, and *then* shall the END come." Mark—as a *witness*—not as the instrument of the *conversion* of all nations—"for, this glorious and immense accession to the king-

1. 2 Pet. iii., 1—4. 2. Isa. lxx., 17. 3. Matt. xxiii., 14.

dom of our Redeemer is an achievement reserved for the *Millennial age*"¹—See on this subject the first fourteen verses of the sixtieth chapter of Isaiah. The question then is, *has the gospel been a witness for the truth of God to ALL nations, or has it not?* "If we look over a map of the world, and the reports of the different Missionary and Bible Societies, we shall find it difficult to place our finger on one spot of the globe where the glorious gospel of the blessed God has not been sent."² This remarkable *Sign*, says Mr. Thorp of Liverpool, in his *Destinies of the British Empire*, moving with speed and majesty in the spiritual heaven of the Universal Church, and indicating the coming of the Lord, *is visible to ALL nations*; for the symbolical angel takes wing *immediately before* the days of vengeance. And it is remarkable, that these noble institutions of Christian benevolence originated in Great Britain, at the momentous crisis when the papal kingdoms began to shake under the visitations of Divine wrath in 1793. Yes, my brethren, it was amidst the rage and madness of Atheism,—amidst the horrors and chaos of anarchy and revolution,—that these societies rose with placid dignity; combining, as they rose, the wealth, the talents, the influence, and the energies of myriads of Christians, in various nations and of all denominations, in one generous effort to rescue the heathen world from the bondage of corruption.³

1. Thorp's *Destruction of the British Empire*, p. 76.

2. Hooper's *Crisis*, p. 7, 8. 3. See Note, Thorp p. 77.

It is believed, therefore, that this "Sign" has performed its *entire circuit* among the nations.

6. *Indulgence of some of the worst passions of our nature, by professing Christians*, is another predicted "Sign" of the Second Advent as nigh at hand. "Then shall many be *offended*, and shall *betray* one another, and shall *hate* one another." ¹ Diversities of *opinion*, to say nothing of articles of *faith* among Christians, possess, inherently, the elements of disunion. And those elements have at times appeared in outbursts of extreme virulence. But, we venture to affirm, that in no instance has such acrimony, such a vituperative and denunciatory spirit exhibited itself as in that of a difference of opinion among Christians regarding *the time* of our Blessed Lord and Saviour's Second Advent. In various parts of England, pulpits have been closed against the advocates of the pre-millennial advent of Jesus, by brethren of the same faith in all other respects, because they viewed that event as *Post-millennial*! Periodical expositors of Prophecy, conducted according to the rules of interpretation founded on this principle, have also been denounced in the most unmeasured terms. And, what is true of England, in both these respects, is true also of our own country. Brethren, I mean not to turn Prophet myself — no, far from it. But, mark ye, — as this truth of the *Pre-millennial* advent of Jesus, with its kindred topics is studied, and believed, and advocated, you will receive abundant additional illustrations of the truth of this predicted "sign" of these last times.

1. Matt. xxiv., 10.

7. The next pre-millennial advent "sign" is, *the advance of human science, and the practical rejection of the presiding wisdom of Revelation*. Take the following passages as the predicted basis of this Sign. "This know also, that in the *last days* perilous times shall come. For men shall be *lovers of their own selves — boasters, proud, blasphemers — heady, high minded.*"¹ — "He is *antichrist* that *denieth* that Jesus is the Christ" — "Every spirit that *confesseth not* that Jesus Christ *is come** in the flesh *is not* of God."² "Let no man deceive you — for *the day of Christ* shall not come, except there come *a falling away first*, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is

1. 2 Tim. iii., 1—4.

2. 1 John iv. 3.

* On the subject of the *last* development of the anti-Christian power, the Rev. Mr. Bickersteth observes, — "It may be gathered, I think, that there is a *growing form* of Antichrist, from the *change* of the Apostle's expressions: a change which should lead us to tremble at the idea of in any way *denying a future coming of our Lord in the flesh*. The remarkable variation in the 1st and 2nd Epistle of John, (not noticed in our translation,) respecting Christ's coming in the flesh, seems to mark *two stages* of Antichrist. In the 1st Epistle (iv. 3,) it is, *every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus is come*, (*εληλυθονα*, already come,) is not of God, and this is that spirit of Antichrist, &c. In the 2nd Epistle, v. 7, it is, *Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come* (*ερχομενος* is coming,) *in the flesh*; this is the deceiver and the Antichrist. — Denying the COMING Savior is one mark of the Antichrist." Indeed, the "very title of Christ is *ερχομενος*, THE COMING ONE." Practical Guide, pp. 110 and 57.

For a similar use of the term, see Matt. xi., 3; xxi., 9; xxiii., 39; Luke vii., 19; Heb. x., 37.

called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." ¹

Now, what do these passages collectively teach us? What, but this?—That through the self-complaisancy and pride of the human mind and heart, the infinite wisdom of God will find a *Rival* in a DEIFICATION of *creature intellect*! Does this sentiment startle you? It startles us also. Yes, —and we have here thrown ourselves into a vast field, with scarcely a moment's time to survey it. We can only now affirm in general terms as a matter of fact, that "*the sufficiency of science is the idol* before which men of all ranks" are at this moment prostrating themselves! In the *Pantheistic-Neology* of Germany — in the *Rationalism* and *Transcendentalism* of America — and in the almost total absence of recognition of an overruling Providence in the *commercial, legislative,* and we had almost said, (and to a great extent we *do* say it,) *ecclesiastical* systems of all nations, "the wisdom of God is (even now) rejected, and the authority of Christ is held to be a ceremony and a name!" ¹

Herein therefore behold the "*three unclean*" *master principles* "like frogs," issuing from the mouth of the apocalyptic "dragon;" (Rev. xvi. 13;) in the form, 1st., of Anarchy and Despotism; 2nd, of atheistic and infidel Science; and 3rd, of Papal, or superstitious theology: all of which, at this very moment constitute so to speak the life blood, the main-spring of

1. Thess. ii. 3, 4.

2. Noel's Brief Inq. p. 106.

action, throughout both the *Old* and the *New* world!

This "Sign of the times" indicates the speedy placing, in his seat, of the *Personal* "Man of Sin, the son of perdition," after whom the whole infidel Anti-christian world is to wander, and whom "they are to worship." Heaven save us from his power!

8. Nearly allied to this "sign," are the events portrayed in the symbolic import of the *sun*, and the *moon*, and the *stars*, &c., named above.

In many nations, yea, in our own, there are "*signs in the sun, and moon, and stars*," the prophetic symbols of their civil and ecclesiastical authorities. — "*The powers of the heavens are shaken*." Monarchs tremble on their thrones, or seek for repose at the sacrifice of their crowns and sceptres. There is, literally, the "*distress of nations*," the "*perplexity*," the agitation, and disquiet, and alarm, set forth by the "*roaring waves of the sea*." May it not be said of all nations, that for the last 20 years, they have been merging more and more into the despicable character of "*a mammon worshipping people*?" Yea, they have fallen down before the idols of their own hands-making, "*political wisdom, national wealth, and commercial prosperity*." And, when those who have by patient examination, and prayer, and watchfulness, observed the movements of Providence in these ominous precursors of national overthrow, and have dared to raise the voice of admonition and alarm, they

1. Rev. xvii. 8; xiii. 8.

have been denounced as "setters forth of strange things!" The national confidence reposed in the omnipotence of *our* triune idol, for instance, evinced itself in deriding these as *madmen*. But, when the pestilence, as in '32, spread disorder and confusion throughout our borders in its fearful midnight and noonday ravages, what terror and dismay were depicted in every countenance? But to come nearer home still, let us advert to the alarm and consternation which every where prevailed during the entire period of our Congressional Session of 1833. Whether the causes which led to this general commotion were imaginary or real, it matters not; neither does it at this time concern us. The *fact* is indisputable. And what was the consequence? Every where the cry was heard, what meaneth this? Whence its origin? What its end? Our political wisdom, our national wealth, and our commercial prosperity, the "staff and stay of our right hand, the Almighty," as it were, "shook in a day, and it bent like a reed shaken with the wind." And I ask what advances have *since* been made toward the removal of those evils? Have they not rather accumulated to an alarming extent? Then also, between neighbor and neighbor, townsman and townsman, brother and brother, confidence was then, and is still destroyed. As then, so now, many covered with dismay, confusion, and blank astonishment, and who think themselves rich in the morning, go to bed in poverty. The fear and dread of these last times rankles within almost every breast, preying upon their hearts like a vulture. Yea, "*men's hearts*

fail them because of fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." And if they would but for a moment turn their attention to an unprejudiced view of the present real state and character of their own and of other nations, they would see in the political, ecclesiastical, and moral *instability* of all, evidence crowding upon evidence, that the *present* "signs of the times" admonish us of *the speedy fulfilment of all that has been either written or spoken by Christ and the prophets concerning us!* Once more, then, I ask, *why* is it that so many *thrones* are tottering? That *republics*, founded it was supposed, on the most invulnerable principles, are shaken to their very centre? That the most *splendid fortunes* are overthrown? That the most *ancient and revered names* are dishonored? That the most *permanent establishments* are laid prostrate? That *credit* between men is so frequently suspended? That the *financial bulwarks* of different nations are subverted? That *divisions*, and *heresies*, and *schisms* are every where devouring by piece-meal the precious vitals of religious truth and order? And, that the *existing civil and ecclesiastical* powers are reeling to and fro like a drunken man? Yea, our national idol, DEMOCRACY, which has been wafted on eagles' pinions to the remotest nations of the earth, and which has furnished themes alike for the poet and the orator of almost every clime—winning, in its resistless course, the "golden opinions" of subjects both of the monarch and the despot—begins now to discover its inheritance of elements of a nature the

most fearfully ruinous. Witness the recent, and now almost daily occurrences of outbreaks of popular commotion among us; and what, I ask, remains but to snap in sunder the cobweb bands which now confine these "roaring waves of the sea" within certain limits, when Democracy, degenerating into a universal anarchy, like a desolating tornado, shall sweep over this now fair and beautiful garden of the new world, and

" ——— leave not a wreck behind."

9. But we pass to another "sign;" it is this: "*The unusual determination of the dominant nations of Europe to maintain the mutual relations of peace;*" a verification of what the apocalyptic "angel" whom John "saw ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God," and who "cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea," said, — "*Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, until we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads.*"¹ Now, is it not remarkable that in the month of July, 1840, the confederated powers of *England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia* united in staying the ravages of the usurper, *Mehemet Ali*, against his Syrian master, the Sultan; which, unchecked, would doubtless have deluged that whole country in a sea of blood. Equally ineffectual thus far have been all those exciting topics mooted between England and our own country, to ultimate an open war. And though to this general state

1. Rev. vii., 2.

of national repose there may be the exception of "wars and rumors of wars," as between England and China, yet the present tranquillized state of the *four allied powers*, sufficiently indicates God's care of his chosen ones, and serves to give them the assurance that not a hair of their head shall perish. Yes, the redeemed of the Lord, collected together from the four corners of the earth, to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in his kingdom; and "the four angels to whom power is given to hurt the earth and the sea," will have nought to do but to turn upon and devour each other! With this sign before us, therefore, my dear brethren, let our humble prayer be, "that we may be counted worthy to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of Man."¹

This tranquillized state of the European and other nations, however, will be but of *short* continuance. Indeed, the present shaking of the nations indicate the speedy fulfilment,

10. Of these predicted signs of our Lord, Matt. xxiv., 6, 7, of "*wars and rumors of wars*," accompanied with *famine*, and *pestilence*, and *earthquakes* in divers places, together with those mentioned Acts ii. 19., of "*wonders* in heaven above, and *signs* in the earth beneath; *blood*, and *fire*, and *vapour of smoke*. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come."

(1) "With regard to *wars*, it is unnecessary to

1. Luke xxi., 36.

enlarge. This species of trouble being every where threatened. The prediction of the battle of Armageddon, (whatever may be the nature of that event) is familiar to every student of prophecy. When "the kings of the earth are gathering together their armies against the Lamb;"¹ "when the heathen shall furiously rage together, and the people imagine a vain thing;"² and before the occurrence of that battle, which shall be, "not with confused noise, and with garments rolled in blood, but with burning and fuel of fire;"³ we may surely believe, that "the nations will be angry," that the passions of men will be roused, and that the whole earth shall be rife with wars and with rumors of wars.

(2.) Next, with regard to famines and pestilences. When God executes judgment upon a guilty nation, he often shows the extent of his power by the variety of calamities which he inflicts. It is not by war merely that he brings down their strength, but he arms the very elements of nature against them. Ezekiel enumerates four sore judgments—the famine, the sword, the pestilence, and the noisome beast; and he threatens, that when the wickedness of men shall have provoked God to inflict them, the presence even of a Daniel, a Job, or a Noah shall not avail to the preservation of a guilty nation. Many perished by famine when Jerusalem was destroyed by the king of Babylon; and afterwards, when it was destroyed by Titus. And Gibbon has remarked the frequency with which fa-

1. Rev. xvii.

2. Psalm ii.

3. Isa. ix.

mines, pestilences and earthquakes occurred during the reign of Justinian, under whom the saints of Christ were given into the hands of the little horn. We might, therefore, conclude, *a priori*, that in the execution of the last judgments upon apostate Christendom, God would pursue the same course; and that the sword would be accompanied by other plagues, such as famines, pestilences, and earthquakes. And this conclusion is confirmed by many passages in the prophetic books of the Old Testament.

One passage which I shall quote, extends from Isa. viii, 21, to ix. 7. The prophet speaks of a great tribulation, during which the conflict takes place when the rod of the oppressor shall be broken as in the day of the Midian, and after which the kingdom of Christ shall be established. And in chap. viii, 21, mention is made of men who shall be "hardly bestead and *hungry*; and it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and shall look upward."

Another passage I shall adduce is Isaiah xlii. 15. This chapter is evidently prophetic of Christ's kingdom. After declaring how the Lord, who had long refrained himself, would at last go forth, like a mighty man, and stir up jealousy like a man of war, he then subjoins these threatening words: "I will make waste mountains and hills, and *dry up all their herbs*; and I will make the rivers islands, and dry up their pools. And I will bring the blind by a way that they know not; I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight." This evidently implies that

God will for a time withdraw the bounties of providence, and thus bring days of straitness and trouble upon the earth, before that final restoration of the Jews, the glory of which shall so far surpass their former deliverance out of Egypt, that that deliverance shall be, in comparison, deemed scarce worthy of remembrance.¹

Another passage I shall adduce is Ezekiel xxviii. 20, to the end. This prophecy is addressed to Zidon, but no one can read it without perceiving that it must belong to some *future* Zidon, which shall be flourishing on the earth in the latter days. The promises contained in the last two verses are applicable only to the millennial state; and in the 23rd verse God threatens that he will send a pestilence and blood into her streets, and thus make her know that he is the Lord.

Other passages might be adduced bearing on the same point. I shall, however, notice only one more, viz. Rev. xvii. 8. It is said of Babyrou, "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, *death* (i. e. *pestilence*) mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire. For strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

From the attentive consideration of these passages we learn that famines and pestilences will constitute a portion of the bitterness of that unparalleled tribulation which as yet awaits the world, and which will precede the establishment of Christ's kingdom.

(3.) And, lastly, with regard to *earthquakes*. We know that the last judgement will be by fire, the fer-

1. Jeremiah xxiii. 7, 8.

vent heat of which will melt the elements of which the earth is composed. And it seems natural to imagine that the fire destined to produce this conflagration, and now perhaps imprisoned beneath the soil on which we tread, will often, as if impatient for a vent, make frequent eruptions, before God finally permits it to break out to execute his work of vengeance. Such eruptions will cause earthquakes. And these minor terrors are to be regarded as harbingers of that last destruction, which shall be accomplished, when the Lord of hosts shall arise to *shake terribly* the earth. It is perhaps by means of these convulsions, that the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and shall smite the river into seven streams.¹ Thus we also learn that in that day, when God shall punish the host of high ones that are on high, the earth shall be utterly broken, that it shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage.² The prophet Joel declares that the Lord shall roar from Zion, and the heavens and the earth shall shake.³ Zachariah foretels, that at the coming of the Lord the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst, towards the east and towards the west, and there shall be a very great vally.⁴ But St. John, in the book of the Revelation, is still more explicit: upon the pouring out of the seventh vial, "there were voices, thunders, lightnings, and a *great earthquake*."⁵

(4.) Other phenomena also, or the predicted "*won-*

1. Isaiah xi. 15. 2. Isaiah xxiv. 19—23. 3. Joel iii. 4.

4. Zech. xiv. 16

5. Rev. xvi. 18.

ders in the heavens, and *signs* in the earth, blood, and fire, and vapour, and smoke, it is more than conjectural have been, and are still receiving their fulfilment in the appearance of the Aurora Borealis, or Northern Lights, respecting which the following appropriate effusion, from the pen of a poet of promise, is here inserted :—

“ Ye gorgeous visions of the Northern sky,
 Mysterious and sublime!
 Who lit your brilliant light on high?
 Stream ye alone in idle revelry,
 Alone, o'er cloudy clime;
 Without an aim, or nature, more
 Than mortal vision can explore?

Or have ye some high, unknown ministry?
 Whence sprang ye into birth?
 In distant realms unseen?
 Or claim ye sisterhood with earth?
 And will your strange ethereal sheen
 Fade with her fading sphere?

Man's wisdom has not told—
 Ye are a MYSTERY,
 Which time perhaps shall ne'er unfold;
Philosophy, whose eagle pinion bold
 Has conquered space, and brought the planets near
 To her expecting eye,
 Has sought in vain to fathom you,
 Or tell the office that ye do.

Ye are of *later* date—
 Say, *are ye for a sign*,
 Lit by the hand Divine,
 Whence earth should read her coming fate?

Signs shall be set in heaven,
And *wonders* meet the eye,
And flaming prodigies be given
Within the upper sky.

Ye may be such—yet man would be
Most backward thus to interpret ye,
Who glides in blind security,
Down time's exhausting tide;
Puts far away the evil day,
Or dreams that he shall dwell for aye,
In all his lust and pride.

Whate'er ye are, ye have an *aim*,
For He has lit your wondrous flame,
Who fashions not a flower in vain.
And howe'er fruitlessly we pry,
Into your inward mystery,
One feature still is plain—
Like as in all his works, sublime or fair,
We trace the glories of the GODHEAD there.*

Respecting these, a late writer remarks, — “And can it be doubted, that the signs in nature—in the heavens and in the earth—have for some time been appearing? We have seen the appearance in the heavens of “blood and fire, and vapour of smoke.” No words could be used to give an idea of the Northern Lights, as they are called, more fitly than these. They so exactly answered the scripture prophecy, as, at first, to occasion great alarm; but, becoming frequent, now scarcely attract the eye of

* Isaac Gray Blanchard, from the “Brother Jonathan.”

curiosity."* I would add, e'er we treat this subject with a spirit of incredulity or in a way of trifling evasion, would it not be well to ask, what, in our view, admitting that the Scriptures teach us to expect that the closing scene of time is to be preceded by certain natural phenomena, would approach nearer thereto than the above? And, who will, who can deny, but that the world appears

"To toll the death-bell of its own decease,
And by the voice of all its elements
To preach the gen'ral doom. When were the *winds*
Let slip with such a warrant to destroy?
When did the *waves* so haughtily o'erleap
Their ancient barriers? —

* These northern lights "appeared in this part of the world early in the present century, just above the Northern Horizon; and about the same time, in much the same manner, they appeared in Europe. They, or something very similar, *a few times* at some periods, had been observed before, viz., 1621, Sept. 2, they were observed all over France. 1581 they appeared in Germany, in an extraordinary manner in April and Sept., and in a less degree at some other times the same year; and the year before, 1580, they were there observed seven times. 1575 they were seen twice in Brabant, February 13, and September 28. 1574 they were observed in England, two nights successively, November 14th and 15th; and also October 7th, 1564, and January 30, 1560. And, there were several such like appearances in the age *immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem*. Before the beginning of the present century, however, they had not been noticed for near an hundred years; but, from that time, or from March 6, 1716, they became very frequent; and continued gradually to rise, and approach toward the South, apparently, widening and spreading as they advanced, and about the middle of this century often reached the Zenith of New England; and at length have proceeded so far South, or have risen so high, as to be seen sometimes in the West-Indies."

Fires from beneath, and *meteors* from above,
 Portentous, unexampled, unexplained,
 Have kindled beacons in the skies; and th' old
 And crazy earth has had her shaking fits
 More frequent, and foregone her usual rests.
 The pillars of our planet seem to fail,
 And nature with a dim and sickly eye
 To wait THE CLOSE OF ALL!"

11. As another "Sign" of the times, we refer you to the predicted *approaching overthrow of the Turkish Empire*, or the drying up of the mystic Euphrates. Here, as though all the preceding "Signs" so to speak, were to fail in awaking the attention of Christians to the awful CRISIS at hand, the Almighty has furnished us with a "Sign" that meets the eye and the ear at every turn. I mean, the present rapid decay and approaching ruin of the Turkish or Ottoman Empire. This Empire, before its consolidation under Othman, was divided into four SULTANIES, having for their capitals *Bagdad, Damascus, Aleppo, and Iconium*. These Sultanies were the "Angels" which were "bound in *the great river Euphrates*," being for a long time confined to its banks by the agency of the Crusades. But, the Apocalyptic "*Sixth* Angel who had the trumpet," was commanded to "*loose these four Angels*," for an appointed time. And, we now observe, that this appointed time is defined and limited, even to *a day*! "And the four Angels were loosed, who were prepared for an *hour*, and a *day*, and a *month*, and a *year*, for to slay the third part of men." ¹ Interpret-

1. Rev. ix. 14, 15.

ing these periods mystically, and they give us the definite number of 391 years and a month. Now, the only period of Turkish history to which this date can with any consistency apply is, when Constantinople was besieged by the Moslem conqueror Mahomet, on the 29th day of May, A. D. 1453. Then, "Constantine, the last of the Cæsars, perished fighting for his country, while thousands fell by his side. And the city experienced the horrors of sack and pillage, heightened by the animosity which the Mahometans felt towards the Christians." Hence Constantinople and the Eastern or *Greek* Empire, was to fall under the ravaging hand of Daniel's "king of a *fierce* countenance," for the above period of 391 years, &c., which, if added to A. D. 1453, brings us down to A. D. 1844, as the period marked in prophecy for the *utter extinction* of the Turkish power. To furnish evidence of the correctness of this position *prospectively*, I have only time now to add, look toward the East! — look at Syria! — listen to the trumpet voice of every gale in its tidings thence, and, if I am not mistaken, you will be disposed rather to antedate than *prolong*, this coming event.

But it may be asked, why attach more of importance to that, than to many other *similar* events equally specified in history? We answer,

12. Because it is in itself a "sign," a *prelude to, and the immediate precursor of, the destruction of the Papal Hierarchy*. The drying up of the mystic Euphrates, or extinction of the Turkish empire, is but the *ante-type* of what was shadowed forth in the di-

version, by Cyrus, of the river Euphrates from its usual course, by which he entered and destroyed ancient Babylon, which all admit to be, a type of the *mystic* or *Papal* "BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."¹ Yes, the extinction of that empire is ordained of heaven for the *especial purpose*, "that the way of the kings of the East may be prepared" to put in their eternal *abjuration* of all *further* allegiance to "the Mother of Harlots" as such, that they may give their honor and power to another,² even "THE MAN OF SIN, THE SON OF PERDITION, who is to exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped!" The *extinction* of the former, therefore, leads directly to the *destruction* of the latter. Now, coupling this with the preceding, we say, "here is a Sign which none can mistake! But, alas, what is the state of Europe," and of our own country, in relation to these events? "Precisely that which characterized Babylon of old, in the night of her great overthrow. Each says within herself, "I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." But what says the prophetic voice? "Therefore shall her plagues come *in one day*, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth thee!" Oh, my feeble prayer is and shall

1. Rev. xvii. 5.

2. 2 Thess. ii. —.

be,—Lord God, open the ears of these two Christian nations, to hear thy warning voice, e'er it be too late!

13. We pass to another "Sign" of the speedy, second, personal advent of Jesus to our earth; viz, "*the present circumstances and expectations of the Jews.*" Of their last long captivity, and the desolation of their beloved city and temple, we have already spoken. We now affirm, that the Scriptures speak of their *final*, and, as we believe, *speedy restoration* to their own land. Daniel says, "When the Lord shall have *accomplished* to scatter the power of his holy people,"¹ i. e., when Jerusalem shall "have been trodden down of the Gentiles, UNTIL *the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled*;"² that *then* there should come out of Zion the DELIVERER, and should *turn away* ungodliness from Jacob."³

But, *how* is this to be brought about? "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the Isles afar off, and say, He that *scattereth* ISRAEL, *will gather* him, and keep him, as a shepherd does his flock."⁴

But *when* will the Lord do this? Answer — as demonstrated in our previous Lecture, the year of our Lord, 1847, is the period when *the sanctuary shall be cleansed*, and Daniel's vision of *Jewish desolation* be accomplished in "*the last end of the indignation.*" This, however, can only be effected, first, *by the ingathering of the Jews to their own land*; and second,

1. Dan. xii., 7.

2. Luke xxi., 24.

3. Isa. lix. 20.

4. Jer. xxxi., 10.

by the destruction of their Great Desolator, the LAST ANTICHRIST, who, with his Armageddon army, upon their restoration, will once more go up against Jerusalem to battle. Then, also, the approaching extinction of the Turkish empire, with the approaching doom of mystic Babylon, connected, as are both these events, with the war of Armageddon, now in actual course of preparation on the part both of kings and people, under the influence of the three frog spirits of the False Prophet of Rev. xvii. 13, ALL transpire under the SIXTH VIAL. And as already stated, as the extinction of the former directly opens the way for the destruction of the latter, all these tremendously important events take place about the same point of time, viz, A. D., 1847.

The *manner*, further, in which the destruction of the last anti-Christian confederacy is to be effected, brings to view, in immediate connexion with the above occurrences of 1847, another event of surpassing grandeur and interest to every true believer. I mean, THE SECOND, PERSONAL, PRE-MILLENNIAL ADVENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST! On this subject we remarked in our former Lecture, (page 241,) that the *close* of the 2,300 years of Jewish desolation, A. D., 1847, as spoken of by Daniel viii. 14, would be signalized by the *cleansing* of the sanctuary — the *accomplishment* of the vision — the *last end* of the indignation — and, the *appearing* of the LORD JEHOVAH for the restoration and re-establishment in Palestine of the seed of Abraham, which he swore unto their fathers.

We now affirm, in the light of prophecy, that the *former* events are but a *consequence* of, and hence *dependent* upon, the *latter*. In other words, until the latter takes place, the former cannot be accomplished.

Here, it would seem incredible, that any, professing to have turned their attention to this subject, should insist upon an interval of 20 years or more, between the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the Second Advent. With others, we are not surprised that they should "view the future coming of Christ as a solitary fact, rather than as a period full of important events." But that any professed student of prophecy should have overlooked the fact, that the termination of Jewish troubles, or the ending of the indignation by the cleansing of the sanctuary in the destruction of their last great enemy, viz, the Armageddon army, is not immediately connected with, not only, but consequent upon the second advent, is to us passing strange. For the satisfaction of others, we think it will be sufficient to adduce scripture proof, that our blessed Lord's return is directly connected with those events. Take for instance the following — In Micah ii. 13, a passage applied by Lowth to the general restoration of the Jewish nation, we have this statement: "The breaker is gone up before them; they have broken up, and passed through the gate, and are gone up by it, and their KING, (Messiah,) shall pass *before* them, and the LORD on the *head* of them." We read in Zechariah xii. 9, "It shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem," &c. Now, it is conceded by all,

that *at this very time* Jerusalem is inhabited by those of the *Jewish* nation. "The siege of the people round about" (the Armageddon army) is to be "both against Judah and Jerusalem."¹ But, it is the Lord himself who brings this very army against them. "Behold, *the day* of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. *For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle,*"² &c. But as in Zech. xii. 9, so in chap. xiv. 3, we read, "THEN shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle." Nor is this all. "HIS FEET SHALL STAND *in that day* (the day of the siege as above,) UPON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES, WHICH IS BEFORE JERUSALEM,"³ &c., when, "by the spirit of his mouth he shall consume, and by the brightness of his coming he shall destroy,"⁴ the antichristian Desolator of the Jewish sanctuary. Then too, "*in that day,*" i. e., the day of the destruction of these Infidel antichristian nations now encompassing Judah and Jerusalem: and with "their king *before* them, and the Lord at the *head* of them standing in a glorious majesty upon the Mount of Olives," shall be fulfilled the promise, "And I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: *and they,* (the house of David, Judah) *shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and mourn,*"⁵ &c. Yes, it is of

1. Zech. xii., 2.

2. Zech. xiv., 1, 2.

3. Zech. xiv., 4.

4. 2 Thess. ii., 8.

5. Zech. xii. 10 — 14.

“that day” the prophet speaks in the same xivth Chap. v. 5th, when he adds, “*And the Lord thy God shall come, and all the Saints, (risen and glorified,) WITH thee.*”

The foundation of the error, which severs the second advent from the preceding, and which places it *beyond* 1847, is predicated of the assumption that *the whole Jewish nation* is to be restored to their own land, *prior* thereto : and this, in order to avoid a truth most plainly taught in all the prophets, viz., the existence, during the period of millenial blessedness, of the saved nations *in the flesh*. In reference however, to the last of these two points, I would only ask your attention to the above xivth Chapter of Zechariah, from the 8th verse to the end ; and of the first, the indulgence to remark, that, in the day of Judah’s last calamity,¹ deliverance,² and conversion,³ ISRAEL, or the ten tribes, *are yet in captivity !* Of the manner of their restoration, I would refer you to the lxvth Chapter of Isaiah, from 15th verse to the end, but particularly to the 19th and 21st verses inclusive. Finally, for a general description of “the peaceable kingdom of the Branch,” *consequent* upon THE SECOND ADVENT, please consult Isaiah ii. 1 — 5 ; lxv. 11, to the end ; and Micah, Chapter iv. —

In conclusion, what remains for us but to adopt the language of David,” and say, “Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion ; *for the time* to FAVOR her,

1. Zech. xiv. 1, 2.

2. Zech. xii. 9, xiv. 3.

3. Zech. xii. 10.

yea, the SET TIME, is come." Yes, this is abundantly evident, both from the attention of the whole Christian world as now directed toward the Jews, and of their own general expectation of and prayer for, the manifestation of their Messiah.*

* For the benefit of those who entertain doubts on this subject, I subjoin the following from "the Christian Intelligencer" of March 26th, 1842.

THE JEWS.

The Rev. T. S. Grimshawe, known to American Christians as the biographer of Leigh Richmond and Cowper, has lately returned from a visit to the East. At a meeting held at Shrewsbury, England, in behalf of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, he said he found in Greece, Turkey and Syria, an extraordinary spirit of inquiry among the Jews. There seemed to be a general impression that the period was at hand when the Jews, as a nation, would return to their own country; that the prophecies mentioned by Daniel and the other prophets were being fulfilled; and that the finger of God was pointed toward Jerusalem, and bidding the Jews to march forward. *There was an universality in it that seemed to be of God*; he found it prevailing in those two cities, and throughout the whole of the Levant. It existed along the banks of the Danube, and he heard of it as generally diffused among the Jews of Poland. In Egypt also he found a similar impression, and he learned from travellers that it prevailed through Abyssinia; and he discovered that it was also prevalent in Palestine. He had no hesitation in stating that the restoration of the Jews is firmly and universally believed by the Jews themselves, more especially in the East, and presumed to be drawing nigh. A Jew, at Constantinople; told him that all they wanted was freedom of inquiry. "Go, sir," said he, weeping, and moistening his (Mr. Grimshaw's) hands with his tears, "to your own land, go to the land of civil and religious liberty, and intercede for the poor Jews, and obtain for them a participation in those privileges by which you yourselves are so greatly distinguished, and know that there are hundreds of us already secretly convinced of the truth of Christianity, who are prepared openly to

14. One more "Sign." As we have made a considerable advance, (as shown in the first Lecture) into

embrace it. "Did I say hundreds," he added, "I would rather say there are thousands, who are inwardly convinced that Jesus is the promised Messiah."—*Zion's Herald*.

To the above I would add the following extract as illustrative of the same fact, from "the Episcopal Recorder" of March 12th, 1842. Not that I suppose Mehemet Ali will either impede or promote this work, except as the Lord will. Isa. xlv. 28; xlv. 10.

MEHEMED ALI.

"The Rev. Mr. Grimshawe, (the same gentleman spoken of above) at a late meeting called to aid the "London Jews' Society," related the following circumstances in relation to his interview with Mehemet Ali, when he made a tour to the East a few years ago.

He remarked that—"he went to Alexandria in a steamer, in which it was his privilege to meet with the Rev. Dr. Duff. He need not say who Dr. Duff was. He was one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of Scotland, distinguished as much for his piety, as for the extent and variety of his learning. With this excellent man he conferred on the desirableness of obtaining an interview with Mehemet Ali, the Viceroy of Egypt, who at that time ruled over both Syria and Palestine, and whose favorable sentiments and disposition he thought it important to ascertain, in reference to the restoration of the Jews. He here alluded particularly to the prophetic statements contained in the 11th chapter of Isaiah on this question, and to the miraculous smiting of the seven streams, that Israel might pass over dry-shod. They were accordingly presented, through the kindness of the Consul General, Col. Campbell, to that extraordinary man. After a few preliminary remarks from the Consul, I availed myself, said Mr. Grimshawe, of a momentary pause to observe that the importance of the subject, and the deep interest attached to it, must plead my apology for introducing it to the notice of his Highness. I then stated that there was a general impression amongst the Jews, throughout the Levant, as well as in other countries, that the time was at hand for their return to the

the 1335 prophetic days of Daniel xii. 12, called emphatically "*the last days*;"¹ and which, "for the

land of their forefathers; that it was not for me to speculate before his Highness as to the ground of that expectation — I simply took it *as a matter of fact*; and begged to ask, whether, in the event of their return taking place, his Highness would feel it to be his duty to throw impediments in the way, or to offer such facilities as might be in his power. He examined me with that keenness and penetration for which he is so remarkable, and kept his eyes fixed upon my countenance, all the time I was speaking. After I had finished, he said — "There is a proposition made to me to this effect — there is an impression among the Jews, *not confined to any particular part*, that they shall return to the land of their forefathers, as this gentleman has stated. *As a matter of fact* I take it then, and my answer is this, that if the Jews are prepared and willing to return to the land of their forefathers, let them return — they are welcome to return; and so far from offering any obstacles, I will give them all the assistance in my power." I told him that I was much gratified by the kindness and condescension of his Highness, and that I was encouraged to submit a further proposition for his consideration — that the Jews were, for the most part, in a state of great destitution, and it would be desirable that they should have an allotment of land as a means of subsistence, and if by his bounty and kindness this privilege could be conceded to them, with an adequate rent by way of remuneration to himself, that this would be a most important accession. He said — "With respect to granting an allotment of land in Palestine, on the supposition that they should return in such numbers as to require it for their wants, my answer is, that I have no land to give them; for though I have a general right over all, I have an individual right to none. It belongs to those whose property it is; but if the Jews are willing to purchase the land of the owners of the soil, and the owners, on the other hand, are willing to dispose of it to them, I will grant to them a full and free possession of their property." I thought this reply a remarkable declaration, and deserving to be ranked among the extraordinary signs of the times."

1. 2 Tim. iii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 3.

elects sake are to be *shortened*; ¹—so it is evident that we have entered upon the *sounding of "the last Trumpet,"* 1 Cor. xv. 52. "In the days of the voice of the 7th angel, when he shall *begin* to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished; as he hath declared to his servants the prophets;" ² "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever," &c. ³ The students of prophecy are not agreed on this point; some think that the seventh trumpet is just about to sound, and that it commences with the seventh vial; others that it *began* to sound at the pouring out of the *first* vial, in the year 1792. I agree with the latter. After a careful investigation of the Apocalypse, I have drawn this conclusion, *that the seven vials are the contents of the seventh seal and of the seventh trumpet.* Chapters xv. and xvi. may be read after vii. and x. In the year 1792, when the *vials* commenced, *began* the *seventh* and *last Trumpet* to sound — *then* we heard its distant blast; which, like the trumpet of Jehovah, hath "*sounded long*," and hath "*waxed louder and louder*," ⁴ and must sound yet, during the outpouring of *another vial*, when the curtain of the drama of this great world will drop, and "a voice be heard from heaven, saying, IT IS DONE!"

1. Dan. xii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 21, 22.

3. Rev. xi. 15 — 19.

2. Rev. i. 7.

4. Exod. xix. 19.

The trump of God is not like the blast of a trumpet blown by the breath of man, which is only of a few moments' duration — “in the *days* of the voice of the *seventh* angel, when he shall *begin* to sound” — it is in the *days* of his sounding which are *over and above* the 1260, comprising the *greater portion* of the 75 days of Daniel, in which the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, &c. “The mystery of God was *finished*” when the seventh angel began to sound, as the events subsequent to 1792 have proved; but it is *during the period* of its sounding that the first resurrection is to take place — the bodies of living saints to be changed — and the dispersed of Israel to return. The seventh and last trumpet I believe *hath* sounded — is *now* sounding — and its blast will, *ere long*, reach the lowest grave, the deepest depth of the sea, the most internal parts of the earth — wherever the ashes of a saint slumbers, it shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and they that hear shall live, shall awake up after the image and likeness of Christ, their bodies being fashioned like unto Christ's most glorious body.¹

15. The last “Sign” to which we invite your attention, is, *that superabundant light which the Holy Spirit has “thrown of late on the prophetic word.* “It shall come to pass, that at even tide it shall be light,” Zech. xiv. 7. “The vision is for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie,” Hab.

1. Hooker of Eng. on the present crisis, p. 19 — 22.

-ii. 3: "In the latter days he shall consider it perfectly," Jer. xxiii. 20; xxx. 24. What Daniel was commanded to seal up and close, (Dan. xii. 4.) is now, through the all powerful mediation of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, revealed unto us, Rev. v. 5. Hence "many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased." Never, I believe, since the days of our Lord's first advent, was the prophetic word so much studied; so many of the ambassadors of Christ engaged in this pursuit; or so much written on the subject. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ" contained in the Apocalypse, showing the coming of the Just One, with all his saints, to the destruction of the apostate nations, is now made so plain to the church, that none can, or at least, ought to be ignorant of it. This however, is a privilege belonging only to the faithful, for it is written, "that none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand," Dan. xii. 10. So St. Paul speaks; "But *ye* brethren, are not in darkness, that the day should overtake *you* as a thief; *ye* are all the children of light, and the children of the day; *we* are not of the night, nor of darkness," 1 Thes. v. 4, 5. Though "the true light now shineth," it enlighteneth *only those who believe*. Those who are paying a prayerful attention to these things, "have," like the Israelites of old, "light in their dwellings," whilst the rest of the world are sitting in darkness, even "darkness such as may be felt." The opening, then, and unfolding of the prophetic word, is another convincing proof that we are arrived at *the end of the age*; the unsealing of prophecy, and the revelation of the

"mystery of God," being reserved unto "THE TIME OF THE END." Dan. xii. 9, Rev. x. 7.¹

If then, my brethren, the light that is in us be *darkness*," by our wilful remissness to secure the advantages which it affords us, Oh, "how great is that darkness!" Open then thine ears I beseech, to hear that bitter lamentation of the compassionate Jesus over the impenitent, unbelieving, slothful, mercy-abusing Jews. "If thou hadst known, even in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace!—But now are they *HID* from thine eyes!"

SUPPLEMENTARY.

On Jubilees, as connected with prophetic chronology.

The manner in which we adverted to this subject, page 191, may have awakened expectations, which, in the sequel, have not been realized. The utmost that we can now venture in regard to them is, to say with Mr. Bickerteth, that while they "*may yet be found*" much to illustrate the chronology of prophecy," that want of accuracy in their application thereto thus far, has failed to inspire us with that confidence in their use to this end, which some claim in their behalf. On this subject Mr. Frere remarks, "that the Jubilee, so peculiar in its institution, must be typical of something greater and more important than itself, there can be little question; and taking into consideration that it prescribed 49 years as the longest period during which any Jew could alienate his land, and that God himself declared upon its institution that the land should not be sold forever for it was his:—taking into account also the many direct prophecies, which predict the restoration in the latter days of Judah and Israel to that land which was given as an inheritance to Abraham and his seed forever;—there will remain no ground of doubt but that the 49 years, (the longest possible period of the alienation of that portion of the land which belonged to any individual Israelite,) represented the time beyond which the whole land should not be nationally alienated, or, "the whole period of the captivities and dispersions of Judah." But, while Mr. Cuninghame, finding, as he claims, a coincidence of Jubilees with astronomical Cycles in the two prophetic numbers of 1260 and 2300, resulting in the termination of the latter number A. D. 1841; Mr. Frere, conducting his calculations on a similar basis, (with the exception that he *intercalates* his Jubilees, and adopts 2400 in the place of 2200 years,) and commencing his reckonings from the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 603, a date authenticated by the Canon of Ptolemy, says, that "49 times times 49, or 2401 years, brings us down to A. D. 1798, when the civil government of Rome, the capital of the last of these four monarchies, was overthrown by the arms of republican France, as described by the pouring out of the third apocalyptic vial of wrath; and a 50th or Jubilee period of 49 years brings us down to A. D. 1847, when it appears, from the vision of the ram and the he-goat, that Jerusalem will be cleansed from the Mahometan superstition, and the Jews reinstated into their own land." This *last* result, though it harmonizes with our chronological deductions as conducted *independently* of Jubilees and Cycles, and consequently tends to increase our confidence in them, yet we wait for further light.

1. Hooker of Eng. on the present crisis, p. 25 — 28.

THE END.



